



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



THE FORUM.

106333

VOL. XXXI.

MARCH, 1901—AUGUST, 1901.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

COPYRIGHT, 1860,
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
82, 84 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK

C O N T E N T S.

| | | |
|--|---------------------------|-----|
| British Rule in the Dominion of Canada | SIR JOHN G. BOURINOT | 1 |
| What of the Democratic Party? | HON. CHARLES DENBY | 15 |
| The Growing Powers of the President | H. L. WEST | 23 |
| Labor Conditions in Switzerland | WALTER B. SCAIFE | 30 |
| The Superintendent from the Primary Teacher's Point of View, | Alice I. Thompson | 47 |
| "Tabloid Journalism": Its Causes and Effects | A. MAURICE LOW | 56 |
| Homicide and the Italians | NAPOLEONE COLAJANNI | 62 |
| The Hopes and Fears of Russia | FELIX VOLKHOVSKY | 69 |
| The Boer War: a Study in Comparative Prediction | H. W. HORWILL | 85 |
| The Nations in Competition at the Close of the Century | JACOB SCHOENHOF | 89 |
| The Machiavelli of Chinese Diplomacy | ROBERT E. LEWIS | 105 |
| The Career of King Edward VII | J. CASTELL HOPKINS | 112 |
| The Preliminary Report of the Isthmian Canal Commission | ALDACE F. WALKER | 131 |
| The English Poor-Law | THOMAS BURKE | 147 |
| The Radical Movement in the Democratic Party | HON. W. C. MAINS | 157 |
| Why Not Three Hundred Million People? | O. P. AUSTIN | 165 |
| Notes on Italian Politics | H. REMSEN WHITEHOUSE | 175 |
| Our Neglected and Prospective Inland Waterways | A. H. FORD | 181 |
| The Hague Peace Conference | EDWARD E. HALE | 197 |
| Prohibition in Kansas | EX-SENATOR W. A. PEPPER | 209 |
| The Limitations of Monopoly | EDWARD S. MEADE | 213 |
| The Case of the South | JOSIAH W. BAILEY | 225 |
| The Grange | KENTON L. BUTTERFIELD | 231 |
| The Search after Novelty in Literature | ALBERT SCHINZ | 243 |
| Aguinaldo's Capture and the Philippine Commission | M. WILCOX | 259 |
| The Russians in Manchuria | PRINCE KROPOTKIN | 267 |
| Bonds of Foreign Governments as American Investments, | PROF. THEODORE S. WOOLSEY | 275 |
| The Lighting of Railway Cars | PROF. G. D. SHEPARDSON | 282 |
| The Negative Side of Modern Athletics | PROF. ARLO BATES | 287 |
| Events of the Dramatic Season | GUSTAV KOBBE | 298 |
| A New Class of Labor in the South | LEONORA BECK ELLIS | 306 |
| Sheep and the Forests | EARLEY V. WILCOX | 311 |
| How London was Saved | JOHN MARTIN | 318 |
| The Spoiled Parent | WILBUR LARREMORE | 328 |
| The Latest Stage of Library Development | ERNEST I. ANTRIM | 336 |
| The Negro and Our New Possessions | PROF. W. S. SCARBOROUGH | 341 |
| Some Chinese Traits | HON. CHARLES DENBY | 350 |
| Bryanism and Jeffersonian Democracy | ALBERT WATKINS | 358 |
| Art as the Handmaid of Literature | PROF. W. H. HOBBS | 370 |

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Governing the Orient on Western Principles | PROF. PAUL S. REIN SCH 387 |
| The Work of the Cuban Convention | ALBERT G. ROBINSON 401 |
| Russian Nihilism of To-Day | ABRAHAM CAHAN 413 |
| The Place of the Senate in Our Government | H. L. WEST 423 |
| The Kaiser's Speeches and German History | KARL BLIND 432 |
| The Religion of a College Student | PROF. F. G. PEABODY 442 |
| The Housekeeper's Stone | ALDEN W. QUIMBY 453 |
| The Manila Censorship | HAROLD MARTIN 462 |
| An American View of the British Industrial Situation | JOHN P. YOUNG 472 |
| The Secrets of Tammany's Success | GUSTAVUS MYERS 488 |
| Poe Fifty Years After | PROF. EDWIN W. BOWEN 501 |
| A Plea for the Integrity of China | W. C. J. REID 515 |
| The Sale of Texas to Spain: Its Bearing on Our Present Problems, | HENRY S. BOUTELL 530 |
| Medical Practice and the Law | CHAMPE S. ANDREWS 542 |
| The Shortened College Course: Graduate Opinion | CHARLES F. THWING 552 |
| The Corrupting Power of Public Patronage | OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD 557 |
| Higher Technical Training | JACOB SCHOENHOFF 561 |
| The Movement for a Shorter Working-Day | W. MACARTHUR 576 |
| The Ethics of Loot | GILBERT REID 581 |
| The Liberal Party: a Menace to English Democracy | HATTIE E. MAHOOD 587 |
| Is the Elective System Elective? | JOHN CORBIN 596 |
| Religious Journalism in England and America | H. W. HORWILL 606 |
| Certain Failures in School Hygiene | R. CLARK 618 |
| A Plea for Architectural Studies | PROF. A. D. F. HAMLIN 626 |
| The Failure of the Two-Party System | ALBERT WATKINS 646 |
| The Government Exhibit at Buffalo | F. W. CLARKE 654 |
| The President's Tour | H. L. WEST 661 |
| Defects in Our Pension System | FRANCIS E. LEU PP 670 |
| Statistical Blunders | HENRY GANNETT 683 |
| The American Workman's "Golden Age" | W. J. GHENT 688 |
| The Uses of Speculation | CHARLES A. CONANT 694 |
| The Spanish Treaty Claims Commission | J. I. RODRIGUEZ 713 |
| Pacification by Arson | EXUL 724 |
| The Metric System and International Commerce | J. H. GORE 731 |
| Is the Actor Illiterate? | STUART ROBSON 741 |
| Moses Coit Tyler | W. P. TRENT 754 |

The Forum

MARCH, 1901.

BRITISH RULE IN THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

I PROPOSE in the present paper to review, as succinctly as possible, the constitutional position of Canada within the British Empire. In other words, I shall attempt to explain, not in legal but in popular form, the exact nature of the relations between the parent State and her great dependency, and the delicate machinery by which the supremacy of the imperial State has been made, in the course of half a century, to work harmoniously with the complete system of self-government which already places Canada in the influential position of a semi-independent nation.

It is now a historical fact that the misunderstandings which severed the old Thirteen Colonies from Great Britain more than a century ago, and even precipitated insignificant revolts in the old Canadian provinces sixty years later, have been entirely removed under the influence of a judicious policy which confers on Canadians a system of responsible or local free government, in the fullest sense of the phrase, and gives her at the same time a position of real weight in imperial councils. As a logical sequence of this wise condition of things, the Canadian provinces are no longer a source of irritation and danger to the parent State; but, possessing full independence in all matters of local concern, they are now among the chief sources of England's pride and greatness.

The Canadian Confederation has now been governed for more than three decades by an imperial statute known as The British North America Act of 1867. This fundamental law of the Dominion sets forth its territorial divisions, defines the nature of the executive author-

Copyright, 1900, by The Forum Publishing Company.
Permission to republish articles is reserved.

ity, regulates the division of powers, directs to what authorities these powers are to be confided, and provides generally for the administration and management of all those matters which fall within the respective jurisdictions of the Dominion and the provinces. In accordance with this constitution, Canada has now control of the government of a vast territory, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to the north of the United States, which is subject to the sovereignty of the King and the Parliament of Great Britain in such matters only as naturally fall under the jurisdiction of the supreme and absolute authority of the sovereign State.

If we come to recapitulate the various constitutional authorities which now govern the Dominion in its external and internal relations as a dependency of the Crown, we find that they may be divided for general purposes as follows:

1. The King.
2. The Parliament of Great Britain.
3. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.
4. The Secretary of State for the Colonies, special adviser of the King in colonial affairs.
5. The Government of the Dominion.
6. The Governments of the Provinces.
7. The Courts of Canada.

We see that at the head of the executive power of the Dominion is the King of England, guided and advised by his privy council, whose history is co-existent with that of the regal authority itself. Through this privy council, of which the cabinet is only a committee, the sovereign exercises that control over Canada and every other colonial dependency which is necessary for the preservation of the unity of the Empire and the observance of the obligations that rest upon it as a whole. Every act of the Parliament of Canada is subject to the review of the King in council, and may be carried from the Canadian courts, under certain legal limitations, to the judicial committee of the privy council, one of the committees which still represent the judicial powers of the ancient privy council of England.

The Parliament of Great Britain — a sovereign body limited by none of the constitutional or legal checks which restrict the legislative power of the United States Congress — can still, and does actually, legislate, from time to time, for Canada and the other colonies of the Empire. From a purely legal standpoint, the legislative authority of this great assembly has no limitation; and it might be carried so far as not merely to restrain any of the legal powers of the Dominion as set forth in the British North

America Act of 1867, but even to repeal the provisions of that imperial statute, in whole or in part.

But while the sovereign of Great Britain, acting with the advice of the privy council and of the great legislative council of the realm, is legally the paramount authority in Canada as in all other portions of the Empire, his prerogatives are practically restrained within certain well understood limits, so far as concerns those countries to which have been extended legislative institutions and a very liberal system of local self-government. It is now a recognized maxim of parliamentary law that it is unconstitutional for the imperial Parliament to legislate for the domestic affairs of a colony which has a legislature of its own. In any review of the legislative acts of the Dominion, the Government of England has for many years past fully recognized those principles of self-government which form the basis of the political freedom of Canada. No act of the Parliament of the Dominion can now be disallowed unless it is in direct conflict with imperial treaties to which the pledge of England has been solemnly given, or with a statute of the imperial legislature which applies directly to the dependency.

The general rule is that no act of the imperial Parliament binds the colonies unless an intention so to bind them appears either by express words or necessary implication. The imperial Parliament may legislate in matters immediately affecting Canada; but it is understood that it does so, as a rule, only in response to addresses of her people through their own Parliament, in order to give validity to the acts of the latter in cases where the British North America Act of 1867 is silent or has to be supplemented by additional imperial legislation.

That act itself was not a voluntary effort of imperial authority, but owes its origin to the solemn expression of the desire of the several legislatures of the provinces, as shown by addresses to the Crown asking for an extension of their political privileges. Within the defined territorial limits of those powers which have been granted by the imperial Parliament to the Dominion and the provinces, each legislative authority can exercise powers as plenary and ample as those of the imperial Parliament itself acting within the sphere of its extended legislative authority. Between the parent State and its Canadian dependency there is even now a loose system of federation under which each governmental authority exercises certain administrative and legislative functions within its own constitutional limits, while the central authority controls all the members of the federation so as to give that measure of unity and strength without which the Empire could not keep together.

and interests of the Canadian people, who, as citizens of the Empire, are entitled to as much weight as if they lived in the British Isles. Not only is Canada consulted, but her right to be represented adequately on every commission or arbitration affecting her special interests has been fully admitted of late years, in acknowledgment of her remarkable political development, and in accordance with the steady growth of a dominant imperial sentiment in the parent state.¹

In the administration of Canadian affairs, the Governor-General is advised by a responsible council, representing the majority of the House of Commons — the elective body of Parliament. As in England, the Canadian cabinet, or ministry, is practically a committee of the dominant party in Parliament, and is governed by the rules, conventions, and usages of parliamentary government which have grown up gradually in the parent State. Whenever it is necessary to form a ministry in Canada, its members are summoned by the Governor-General to the privy council of Canada — another illustration of the desire of the Canadians to imitate the old institutions of England and to copy her time-honored procedure.

It would be a great mistake to suppose that the Governor-General is a mere *roi fainéant*, and a mere ornamental portion of our political system, to be set to work and kept in motion by his council. Lord Elgin, the ablest of constitutional governors, has left it on record that in Jamaica, where there was no responsible government, he had not "half the power" he had in Canada, "with a constitutional and changing cabinet." This influence, however, was "wholly moral, an influence of suasion, sympathy, and moderation, which softens the temper while it elevates the aims of local politics." If the Governor-General is a man of parliamentary experience and constitutional knowledge, possessing tact and judgment, and imbued with the true spirit of his high vocation — and these high functionaries have been notably so since the commencement of Confederation — he can sensibly influence, in the way Lord Elgin points out, the course of administration and benefit the country at critical periods of its history.

Standing above all party, having the unity of the Empire at heart, a Governor-General can at times soothe the public mind, and give additional confidence to the country, when it is threatened with some national calamity, or there is distrust abroad as to the future. As an imperial officer he has large responsibilities of which the general public have naturally no very clear idea. And if it were possible to obtain access to the confidential and secret despatches which seldom see the light in the colonial

¹ See my article in *THE FORUM* for May, 1898, on "Canada's Relations with the United States and her Influence in Imperial Councils."

office — certainly not in the life-time of the men who wrote them — it would be seen how much, for half a century past, the colonial department has gained by having had in British North America men no longer acting under the influence of personal feeling through being made personally responsible for the conduct of public affairs, but actuated simply by a desire to benefit the country over which they preside, and to bring Canadian interests into union with those of the Empire itself.

The Parliament of Canada consists of the King, the Senate, and the House of Commons. In the formation of the upper house, three geographical groups were arranged in the first instance — Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritime Provinces — and each group received a representation of twenty-four members. More recently other provinces have been admitted into the Dominion without reference to this arrangement; and now seventy-eight senators altogether may sit in Parliament. The remarkably long tenure of power enjoyed by the Conservative party — twenty-five years from 1867 — enabled it, in the course of time, to fill the upper house with a very large numerical majority of its own friends.

This fact, taken in connection with certain elements of weakness inherent in a chamber which is not elected by the people, and which has none of the ancient privileges or prestige of a House of Lords long associated with the names of great statesmen and the memorable events of English history, has created an agitation among the Liberal party for radical changes in its constitution which would bring it, in their opinion, more in harmony with the people's representatives in the popular branch of the general legislature. While some extremists would abolish the chamber, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and other prominent Liberals recognize its necessity in our parliamentary system.

The House of Commons, the great governing body of the Dominion, has been made, so far as circumstances will permit, a copy of the English house. Its members are not required to have a property qualification; and they are elected by the votes of the electors of the several provinces, where, in a majority of cases, universal suffrage, under limitations of citizenship and residence, prevails.

In each province there is a lieutenant-governor, appointed by the Dominion Government for five years, an executive council, and a legislature consisting of one house only, except in Nova Scotia and Quebec, where a legislative council appointed by the Crown still continues. The principles of responsible government exist in all the provinces, and practically in the Northwest Territory.

In the enumeration of the legislative powers respectively given to

the Dominion and provincial legislatures, an effort was made to avoid the conflicts of jurisdiction that have so frequently arisen between the National and State Governments of the United States. In the first place, we have a recapitulation of those general or national powers that properly belong to the central authority, such as customs and excise duties, regulation of trade and commerce, militia and defence, post-office, banking and coinage, railways and public works "for the general advantage," navigation and shipping, naturalization and aliens, fisheries, weights and measures, marriage and divorce, penitentiaries, criminal law, census and statistics. On the other hand, the provinces have retained control over municipal institutions, public lands, local works and undertakings, incorporation of companies with provincial objects, property and civil rights, administration of justice, and generally "all matters of a merely local and private nature in the province." The residuary power of legislation rests with the general Parliament of Canada.

In 1875, the Parliament of Canada established a supreme court, or general court of appeal, for Canada, the highest function of which is to decide questions as to the respective legislative powers of the Dominion and provincial parliaments which are referred to it, in due process of law, by the subordinate courts of the provinces. The decisions of this court are already doing much to solve difficulties which impede the successful operation of the constitution. As a rule, cases come before the supreme court on appeal from the lower courts; but the law regulating its powers provides that the Governor-General in council may refer to this court any matter on which a question of constitutional jurisdiction has been raised. But the supreme court of Canada is not necessarily the court of last resort. The people have an inherent right, as subjects of the King, to appeal to the judicial committee of the privy council of the United Kingdom.

But it is not only by means of the courts that a check is imposed upon hasty or unconstitutional legislation. The constitution provides that the Governor-General may veto or reserve any bill passed by the two houses of Parliament when it conflicts with imperial interests or imperial legislation. It is now understood that the reserve power of disallowance which His Majesty's Government possesses under the law is sufficient to meet all possible cases. The sovereign power is never exercised except in the case of an act clearly in conflict with an imperial statute or in violation of a treaty affecting a foreign nation. The Dominion Government also supervises all the provincial legislation, and has, in a few cases, disallowed provincial acts. This power is exercised very carefully, and is regarded with intense jealousy by the provincial governments, which have

more than once attempted to set it at defiance. In practice it is found the wisest course to leave to the courts the decision in cases where doubt exists as to the constitutional authority or jurisdiction.

The organized districts of the Northwest — Assiniboia, Alberta, Athabaska, and Saskatchewan — are governed by a lieutenant-governor, appointed by the Government of Canada, and aided by a council chosen by himself from an assembly elected by the people under a very liberal franchise. These territories have also representatives in the two houses of the Parliament of Canada. The Yukon territory, in the far Northwest, where rich discoveries of gold have attracted a large number of people within the last two years, is placed under a provisional government, composed of a commissioner and a council, partly elected by the people and partly appointed by the Dominion Government, and acting under instructions given from time to time by the same authority or by the Minister of the Interior. The public service enjoys all the advantages that arise from permanency of tenure and appointment by the Crown. On the whole, it has been creditable to the country and remarkably free from political influences.

The criminal law of England has prevailed in all the provinces since it was formally introduced by the Quebec Act of 1774; but the civil law of the French régime has continued to be the legal system in French Canada since that act took effect, and has now obtained a hold in that province which insures its permanence as an institution closely allied with the dearest rights of the people. Its principles and maxims have been carefully collected and enacted in a code which is based on the famous Code Napoleon. In the other provinces and territories, the common law of England forms the basis of jurisprudence on which a large body of Canadian statutory law has been built in the course of time.

At the present time, all the provinces, with the exception of Prince Edward Island, have an excellent municipal system, which enables every defined district, large or small, to carry on efficiently all those public improvements essential to the comfort, convenience, and general necessities of the different communities that make up the province at large. Even in the territories of the Northwest, every proper facility is given to the people in a populous district or town to organize a system equal to all their local requirements.

Every Englishman will consider it an interesting and encouraging fact that the Canadian people, despite their neighborhood to a prosperous federal commonwealth, should not have shown any disposition, even in the most gloomy periods of their history, to mould their institutions directly

on those of the United States, and lay the foundation for future political union. Previous to 1840, which was the commencement of a new era in the political history of the provinces, there was a time when discontent prevailed throughout the Canadas; but not even then did any large body of the people threaten to sever the connection with the parent State. The Act of Confederation was framed under the direct influence of Sir John Macdonald and Sir George Cartier; and, although one was an English-Canadian and the other a French-Canadian, neither fell short of the other in the desire to build up a Dominion on the basis of English institutions, in the closest possible connection with the mother country.

While the question of union was under consideration, it was English statesmen and writers alone who predicted that this new federation, with its great extent of territory, its abundant resources, and ambitious people, would eventually form a new nation independent of Great Britain. Canadian statesmen never spoke or wrote of separation, but regarded the constitutional change in their political condition as giving them greater weight and strength in the Empire. The influence of British example on the Canadian Dominion can be seen throughout its governmental machinery — in the system of parliamentary government, in the constitution of the privy council and the Houses of Parliament, in an independent judiciary, in appointed officials of every class, in the provincial as well as Dominion system, in a permanent and non-political civil service, and in all the elements of sound administration.

During the thirty-three years that have passed since 1867, the attachment to England and her institutions has gained in strength; and it is clear that those predictions of Englishmen to which I have referred have been completely falsified. The war in South Africa has given remarkable proof of the power of this attachment. The dominant sentiment is for strengthening the ties that have in some respects become weak in consequence of the enlargement of the political rights of the Dominion, which has assumed the position of a semi-independent power, since England now only retains her imperial sovereignty by declaring peace or war with foreign nations, by appointing a Governor-General, by controlling colonial legislation through the King in council and the King in Parliament — but not so as to diminish the rights of local self-government conceded to the Dominion — and by requiring that all treaties with foreign nations should be made through her own Government, while recognizing the right of the dependency to be consulted and directly represented on all occasions when its interests are immediately affected.

In no respect have the Canadians followed the example of the United States, and made their executive entirely separate from the legislative authority. On the contrary, there is no institution which works more admirably in the federation—in the general government as well as in the provincial governments—than the principle of making the ministry responsible to the popular branch of the legislature, in that way keeping the executive and legislative departments in harmony with each other, and preventing that conflict of authorities which is a distinguishing feature of the very opposite system that prevails in the Federal Republic.

If we review the amendments made of late years in the political constitutions of the States, and especially those ratified not long since in New York, we see in how many respects the Canadian system of government is superior to that of the Republic. For instance, Canada has enjoyed for years, as results of responsible government, the secret ballot; stringent laws against bribery and corruption at all classes of elections; the registration of voters; strict naturalization laws; infrequent political elections; separation of municipal from provincial or national contests; appointive and permanent officials in every branch of the civil service; a carefully devised code of private bill legislation, and the printing of all public as well as private bills before their consideration by the legislative bodies.¹

Of course, in the methods of party government we can see in Canada at times an attempt to follow the example of the United States, and to introduce the party machine with its professional politicians and all those influences that have degraded politics since the days of Jackson and Van Buren. Happily, so far, the people of Canada have proved themselves fully capable of removing those blots that show themselves from time to time on the body politic. Justice has soon seized those men who have betrayed their trust in the administration of public affairs.

Although, according to their political proclivities, Canadians may find fault with some methods of government and be carried away at times by political passion beyond the bounds of reason, it is encouraging to find that all are ready to admit the high character of the judiciary for learning, integrity, and incorruptibility. The records of Canada do not present a single instance of the successful impeachment or removal of a judge for improper conduct on the bench since the days of responsible government; and the three or four petitions laid before Parliament, in the course of a quarter of a century, asking for an investigation into vague charges against some judges, have never required a judgment of the house.

¹ I enter somewhat fully into this subject in an article in *THE FORUM* for May, 1895.

Canadians built wisely when, in the formation of their constitution, they followed the English plan of retaining an intimate and invaluable connection between the executive and legislative departments, and of keeping the judiciary practically independent of the other authorities of government. The life and prosperity of the people, as well as the satisfactory working of the whole system of Federal Government, rest more or less on the discretion and integrity of the judges. Canadians are satisfied that the peace and security of the whole Dominion do not more depend on the ability and patriotism of statesmen in the legislative halls than on that principle of their constitution which places the judiciary in an exalted position among all the other departments of Government, and makes law as far as possible the arbiter of their constitutional conflicts.

In comparing the federal constitution of the Australian Commonwealth with that of the Canadian Dominion, we must be impressed by the fact that the constitution of Canada appears more influenced by the spirit of English ideas than the constitution of Australia, which has copied some features of the fundamental law of the United States. In the preamble of the Canadian British North America Act, we find expressly stated "the desire of the Canadian provinces to be federally united into one Dominion under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom," while the preamble of the Australian constitution contains only a bald statement of an agreement "to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown."

When we consider the use of "Commonwealth" — a word of republican significance to British ears — as well as the selection of "State" instead of "Province," of "House of Representatives" instead of "House of Commons," of "executive council" instead of "privy council," we may well wonder why the Australians, all British by origin and aspiration, should have shown an inclination to deviate from the precedents established by the Canadian Dominion, which, though only partly English, resolved to carve the ancient historic names of the parent State on the very front of its political structure.

As the several States of the Commonwealth have full control of their own constitutions, they may choose at any moment to elect their own governors, as do the States of the American Union, instead of having them appointed by the Crown, as in Canada. We see also an imitation of the American constitution in the principle which allot^s to the central Government only certain enumerated powers, and leaves the residuary power of legislation to the States. Again, while the act provides for a high court

and other federal courts, the members of which are to be appointed and removed as in Canada by the central Government, the States are still to have full jurisdiction over the State courts as in the United States.

The Canadian constitution, which gives to the Dominion exclusive control over the appointment and removal of the judges of all the superior courts, offers a positive guarantee against the popular election of judges in the provinces. It is not going too far to suppose that, with the progress of democratic ideas in Australia — a country inclined to political experiments — we may find the experience of the United States repeated, and see elective judges make their appearance when a wave of democracy has suddenly swept away all dictates of prudence and given unbridled license to professional political managers anxious for the success of party only.

In allowing the British Parliament to amend the Act of Union on an address of the Canadian Parliament, we have yet another illustration of the desire of Canadians to respect the supremacy of the sovereign legislature of the Empire. On the other hand, the Australians make themselves entirely independent of the action of the imperial Parliament, which might be invaluable in some crisis affecting deeply the integrity and unity of the Commonwealth, and give full scope to the will of democracy expressed at the polls. In also limiting the right of appeal to the King in council — by giving to the high court the power to prevent appeals in constitutional disputes — the Australians have also, to a serious degree, weakened one of the most important ties that now bind them to the Empire, which affords additional illustration of the inferiority of the Australian constitution, from an imperial point of view, compared with that of the Canadian Dominion, where a reference to the judicial committee of the privy council is highly valued.

No country in the world gives more conclusive evidences of substantial development and prosperity than the Dominion of Canada under the influences of responsible government and federal union. This system of union gives, as was hoped by its promoters, thirty-six years ago at Quebec, due expansion to the national energies of the whole Dominion, and at the same time affords every constitutional security to the local interests of each provincial member of the federal compact. No dangerous question like slavery or the expansion of the African race in the United States exists to complicate the political and social conditions of the confederation; and although there is a large and increasing French-Canadian element in the Dominion, its history so far need not create fear as to the future, except perhaps in the minds of gloomy pessimists. While this element naturally clings to its national language and institutions, yet,

under the influence of a complete system of local self-government, it has always taken as active and earnest a part as the English element in establishing and strengthening the confederation. It has steadily grown in strength and prosperity under the generous and inspiring influence of British institutions.

Professor Freeman has truly written that in Canada, which is pre-eminently English in the development of its political institutions, French Canada is still "a distinct and visible element, which is not English — an element older than anything English in the land — and which shows no sign of being likely to be assimilated by anything English." Though nearly a hundred and forty years have passed since the signing of the treaty of Paris, many of the institutions which the French-Canadians inherited from France have become permanently established in the country ; and we see constantly in the various political systems given to Canada from time to time — notably in the constitution of the federal union —the impress of these institutions and the influence of the people of the French section.

While the French-Canadians, by their adherence to their language, civil law, and religion, are decidedly "a distinct and visible element which is not English" — an element kept apart from the English by positive legal and constitutional guarantees or barriers of separation — nevertheless, it is the influence and operation of English institutions which have made their province one of the most contented communities of the world. While their old institutions are inseparably associated with the social and spiritual conditions of their daily lives, it is, after all, their political constitution, which derives its strength from English principles, that has made the French-Canadians a free, self-governing people, and developed the best elements of their character to a degree which was never possible under the depressing conditions of the French régime.

It is the influence of this liberal federal constitution, which owes its origin to the joint efforts of French- and English-Canadians alike, that has given to Canada so many able statesmen of French origin, and has at last placed at the head of the administration of public affairs a brilliant French-Canadian, who has often declared that it is the aspiration of his public life to unify the two races, and build up a powerful Canadian nation in the closest possible connection with England, on the basis of compromise, conciliation, and justice to every class and creed.

JOHN G. BOURINOT.

WHAT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY ?

AMONG those who, for want of a better name, are called Gold Democrats, there is an immense tendency to write either a biography of, or an epitaph for, the Democratic party. The rule in literature is that the first requisite for the biographer is that he should love his subject. It is evident, therefore, that the recalcitrant Democrat should not undertake to write a biography of his former party. The other rule, that nothing but good should be said of the dead, applies as strongly to the writers of epitaphs. It is, therefore, conclusive that the Gold Democrats must be excluded from a literary post-mortem of the party. Mr. Cleveland has been drawn into this six-day tournament, and with his usual good sense has enunciated the apothegm that "the rank and file ought to be consulted." Undoubtedly, this is the fundamental principle of a self-governing Democracy. In obedience to my own rules, I shall not undertake to offer any advice to my former comrades, because I voted for Mr. McKinley. I shall simply discourse a little, as all men have the right to do, on the conduct of future political campaigns.

In the first place, it may be remarked that "vinegar catches no flies." The high-handed denunciation of all the Democrats who failed to support Mr. Bryan and their eternal exclusion from the party are only the effervescence of a temporary irritation. At the worst, these sinners should only suffer the pains of purgatory. Possibly, if they were to wash themselves nine times in the Wabash, they might be taken back into the party. Jesting apart, when the actual war is on, recruits will be sought anywhere, and welcomed no matter whence they come. The greatest sinner of all in 1896, Mr. Bourke Cockran, bore the banner in 1900, and the return of the very few prodigals who came back was celebrated with many hosannas. In a town that I know of only one man turned his coat, while a family of thirteen came over to true principles, as did many other people. No man need be afraid that he will have any difficulty in breaking into the Democratic party in 1904, if he wants to get in. There's the rub. There's the real trouble. Will he want to get in?

Who can tell whether the old men who were always Democrats until

1896 will want to enter the triune portals of free silverism, Populism, and anti-injunctionism? Some of them have said already that the Republican party is good enough for them, and that they are tired of wild political theorizing. The difficulty is going to be for any party calling itself Democratic to win away from their new love a class of people who, after a strenuous fight with themselves, have succeeded in breaking party ties. Party principles enunciated at national Democratic conventions must be greatly changed before the confidence of great numbers of former Democrats can be secured.

Free silver has been already practically offered up as a sacrifice on the new altar which is to be erected. As everybody wants to get the best money he can get, it is not likely that the effort to debase the currency will ever be revived as a political measure. The defeated candidate may well announce now that he will accept silver at par for his paper, because the Government takes care that it shall be worth dollar for dollar of gold. But how would it have been if he had been elected, and were required to accept forty-seven cents instead of a dollar?

Antagonism to the issuing of writs of injunction as precautionary measures to prevent the perpetration of crime seems still to be in some favor. Why this should be so passes the comprehension of the ordinary citizen. If a man who owns a factory is notified that a body of men intend to burn it down, and is also informed that he can stop them by a little bit of white paper, with a seal on it, he would be very foolish, would he not, if he failed to secure this easy protection? Indeed, the factory owner accomplishes, without any trouble to speak of, two good purposes: (1) The saving of his property from destruction; and (2) the preventing of incipient criminals from becoming inmates of the penitentiary. Just think of it! The walls and fences of a delightful city, away down in southern Indiana, were more often placarded with horrible anti-injunction diatribes than with any other panacea. Still, the city went several hundred in favor of protection by law.

How can the leaders of any party have so low an opinion of the workingman as to believe that he has so little intelligence that his vote can be influenced by cheap appeals to prejudice? In this day of industrial movement the man of sense will no more think of patronizing workingmen than he will of patronizing millionaires. What family in this land has not a workingman among its members? I pity the millionaire who has no tie to bind him to a class which is day by day helping to make our country the greatest, the most prosperous, and the most influential one in the world. Why, we all meet these workingmen every day. This one works

at the railroad shops; another in the electric works; others in manufactories of various kinds. In seeing them and talking to them, it is exceedingly difficult to discover wherein the young banker or lawyer or doctor is superior to them in manners and bearing. These young workingmen some day will be presidents of great railroads or of huge manufactories, or chiefs of lines of steamships, or builders of twenty-story houses. Away with all appeals to class prejudice — leave them to the Populists, the communists, the anarchists! When the Democrats went barefooted to the polls, they were the freest and most intelligent of politicians; and in this regard, although they wear shoes now, they have not changed. Just try once to patronize them!

Almost the only positive declaration in the Chicago platform which was inserted into the Kansas City platform was a clause favoring an income tax. It may be set down as certain that, when necessary, such a tax will be favored by all the people who will not be affected by it. If the limit of exemption is fixed at four thousand dollars, the majority in favor of such a tax will be stupendous. But it must be said that taxation should not be favored by anybody unless it be absolutely necessary to raise money for public uses. The inventor of new taxes is no more entitled to honor and praise than is the Boxer who invents new tortures. Taxation is an evil that must be borne, like sickness. It has absolutely no excuse for existence except necessity. It is the most constant, wearying, and annoying of all the evils that civilization has brought on man. In the last campaign, of course, the Democratic party gained nothing by favoring the income tax. No accorded position was given to it in the platform, but it came in with the usual *detritus* of such documents. If money derived from an income tax could be made to take the place of the wretched tax on bank cheques, telegraph messages, contracts, and the other petty taxes so annoying to the people, all the people except those who pay such taxes will be glad; but if the income tax is simply to be added to the exactions already in existence no possible benefits will accrue to anybody.

There are towns in this country where the people are kept forever busy in paying exactions. Decent and respectable brick pavements are taken up every day, and a new article of manufactured stone is put down. Soon this will give way to marble, just as macadamizing and paving with stone and brick are giving way to asphalt. The people of these towns are reduced to preying on each other. In a century or two they will have a splendid system of parks, and avenues of shade trees; but the towns will be fenced in. If men are looking around for principles for re-formed

political parties, I advise them to guard against overlooking the question of taxation.

Another thing comes within the purview of this disquisition, and that is the foreign policy of the country. The position of parties has been reversed. Forty years ago the synonym for Democracy was the word "progress." We were expansionists; we had annexed all the territory that could be acquired; we were ambitious and brave; we had absolute faith in republican institutions; we were in favor of the acquisition of Cuba. Now, although a majority of Democrats both North and South are in favor of the same views, no one dares to put them in a written platform.

Everything is changed. We do not seem to know where "we are at." We have uncongenial associates, who come into our living room, put their feet on top of the mantel-piece, and make themselves perfectly at home, the same as if they were members of the family — which they never were! Every man seems to be for himself, and "cusses" his neighbor. As Senator Vest is said to have put the situation: "The young dogs hunt nothing but varmints, and the old dogs won't hunt at all."

We have been playing *Polonius* to Mr. Bryan's *Hamlet*. We have called our platform a "camel," a "weasel," or a "whale," as our young Hamlet has dictated. Compare the original with the facts:

Ham. Do you see yonder cloud, that's almost in shape of a camel?

Pol. By the mass, and 'tis like a camel, indeed.

Ham. Methinks, it is like a weasel.

Pol. It is backed like a weasel.

Ham. Or, like a whale?

Pol. Very like a whale.

The parallel is complete to the end, because *Hamlet* stabbed and killed *Polonius*, while intending to kill another man!

Mr. McKinley has appropriated our faith, and made it the rallying-cry with which to sweep the impressionable West; and, naturally, we can support no principle that he favors. It is one of the troubles of politics that partisans must antagonize even the purest and best principles if their antagonists adopt them. But the world is outgrowing this attitude. Day by day the independent vote is growing larger, and on election day it sweeps into oblivion party allegiance. It is right that this should be as it is. It is implicitly true that one may rely on this great, calm, patriotic people to do what is just at each presidential election. Because General Washington said that we must not leave our own to stand on foreign ground, our foreign policy has been uncertain. We

wrote the doctrine of non-intervention in foreign affairs as the fundamental principle of our Government in every state paper and in the platforms of all conventions. Yet the time soon came when Jefferson modified it by holding that this principle did not forbid the purchase of Louisiana; and from that time on we have acquired all the territory on this continent that we could get. We went a bowshot farther, without noticeable opposition, and as a gift accepted Hawaii, at the cross-roads of the Pacific, where the ships going to Australia cross those coming from the Orient. Then we branched off again and took Tutuila of the Samoan group, Porto Rico near our own shores, Guam in the Ladrones, the Philippines, and, recently, two little waifs which were not described in the Paris Treaty, although they ought to have been. All these atrocious and notorious departures from our ancient policy have been approved by the people, who have given to the doctrine of expansion the testimonial of an enormous majority in the re-election of its chief exponent. Still, the opposition to expansion, which has taken on the cant name of "anti-imperialism," is not dead, and there is great danger that in the organization of a new party its founders will make it the foundation stone. It is for this reason that some observations may be appropriately offered, as *amicus curiae* simply, against this new perpetration of hari-kiri.

It is certainly true that the Spanish war was not begun for purposes of territorial aggrandizement. Our neighbor's house in Cuba was being burned down, and his family was suffering. His condition affected injuriously our own comfort and well-being; so we went to work to restore peace and quietude, with no after-thought of any but consequential benefits to ourselves. This task was accomplished, and soon Cuba will be independent. Almost all Americans hope that voluntarily the Cubans will ask us to admit them into the Union, and no man doubts that this request will be granted. It will be the case of Texas repeating itself, and woe be to the political party which antagonizes a consummation so greatly to be desired.

Dewey's victory gave us the Philippines. We were primarily aghast. We did not know what to do with the white elephant which at one blow became ours. We hesitated, and argued; but, finally out of all the discussion came the decision that it was our duty to hold the islands. When the Anglo-Saxon realizes that duty points the way he is apt to be obstinate. It seemed plain to all observers that it would be cruel and unjust to give the Philippines back to Spain. That country had oppressed them for three hundred years, and it was probable that the harshest measures toward the Filipinos would be adopted from a presumed

necessity. We could not in justice or in honor give them to another nation, and the demand to do so did not rest upon us.

There were but two courses: one was to keep them for ourselves, and the other to make them independent. I pass over the protectorate idea. No one has seriously considered it. Protection around the world means simply the first step to agglutination, and it is not clearly to be understood why it should mean anything else. Nations are not eleemosynary societies. The word imperialism has not struck the people with much force. It is too shadowy, too remote, too improbable. It was found to be difficult to convince the masses that their rights were endangered because we had once more expanded. Having expanded so many times without injury, history did not seem to support the allegation that there was danger to our own liberties in doing so once again. The Democrats made a serious mistake in adopting as a paramount doctrine the theory that our own liberties depended on the issues of the election. They would have done better, perhaps, if they had left their eloquence — which plainly bored their audiences — behind, and argued that the acquisition of the Philippines would not benefit us materially or morally. They did not condescend to get on this practical ground, but pictured horrible evils which would result to us, as if our own stalwart men had forgotten how to shoot their rifles.

The men who rule the Government never dreamed of empire, and no man ever seriously believed they did. They have adopted the theory of expansion not for the sake of having colonies, and still less for the arbitrary and oppressive rule of annexed territories, but in order to improve the general condition of our own people, to increase our commerce, and to furnish new fields for the sale of our manufactured goods. Whether or not the Philippines were to be independent, at all events they took the wrong method to become so. On the night of February 4, 1899, the Filipinos vigorously attacked our troops; and from that time to this, in spite of numerous efforts to conciliate them, they have waged war on us. There is not much use, therefore, to talk of making them independent now. The flag that went up in honor must not come down in dis-honor. We must put down the insurrection first. The Filipino preferred to fight first and explain afterward, and as he began the fight he must quit first.

The impossibility of refusing to take some part in foreign affairs is plainly shown in our conduct toward China. Ought we to have remained quiet and passive while the Chinese soldiers and their Boxer allies were endeavoring, with fiendish cruelty, to murder our men, women,

and children at Tientsin and Pekin? All over Chihli and Shantung the Boxers sought out the foreigners, tortured and killed them. At Tientsin first and Pekin afterward, they met with resistance from foreign troops. Few men in this country complained that the President sent five thousand American soldiers to save the lives which, without their aid, would have been horribly sacrificed. No man has asked where he got his warrant for ordering our troops to a foreign country. If, in the most awful and remarkable event that the history of the world can show, we had stood back pitiless, there would have been pointed at us for all time the slow, unmoving finger of scorn. We did right! We know we did right, and we are proud of it. As we faced the theory of non-intervention last summer, so we will face it again when the proper case arises.

One hundred and ten years ago we had four millions of people. We were wearing short clothes then. Now we are grown, or nearly so; we have expanded immensely. Conditions are changed; the world has been revolutionized by art and science; its various countries are closer together. China herself, with all the efforts that she can make, cannot preserve her isolation. No more can we preserve ours. For one of its planks, the new political party should adopt intervention in all cases where our interests are involved. What else should it do? Who can tell? The Republicans seem to have a knack of appropriating our theories when they are good, and of vigorously using them against us when they are vicious.

Think of it: the Wizard of the White House has won or is winning the South — our special appanage — over to himself! He did it so simply that all the world thought his conduct was real and natural, as no doubt it was; but no man ever thought of doing it before. He whose ancestors lived on James River might appropriately have done this thing. Had it been a matter of greatness simply he would have done it; but the magician from Ohio, who wins all hearts by his gentleness and kindness and tact, came upon the scene; and to his touch of chivalry the great, warm heart of the South bounded with responsive emotion, as if it would break. Think of it: this major of the Civil War on the Union side, this President from the North, recommended that Confederate dead should repose forever in graves tended by the Union! And, more than that, he wore a Confederate badge at Atlanta. Only here and there did rare criticism come up from half the States — nothing but grateful and gracious encomiums came from the others. The President is the most popular man in the South to-day. In general, his most virulent political enemies, when they attack his policy, lay the blame on "his wicked partners." Suppose for a

moment that Grover Cleveland had done such acts of generous sympathy as these, what a riot of denunciation would have played across his path!

The reader will delve in vain into current history to find out how and why Mr. Cleveland became the *bête noire* of the Democratic party. It will be a question for future history, like the identity of the man who wore the iron mask. When it is solved it is safe to predict that in no jot or tittle will its solution detract from the fame of Grover Cleveland.

CHARLES DENBY.

THE GROWING POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT.

OVER one hundred years ago the founders of our Republic adopted an instrument of writing which has since been known to history as the Constitution of the United States. The first sections of the first, second, and third articles, respectively, declared:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish.

Here, then, we have the national Government divided into three separate and distinct branches: legislative, executive, and judicial. It will be noted that the legislative is placed first, and the amount of space devoted to it in the Constitution plainly manifests the regard in which it was held by the framers of that wonderful document. They rightly appreciated that in a republican form of government the popular branch must be paramount; and they endeavored, therefore, after emerging from thralldom under an obstinate and tyrannical ruler, to emphasize the power of the people. Congress was to be the brake and safeguard in the national scheme. It was to enact laws over the President's veto; the Senate was to have equal voice with the President in the appointment of the higher officials; and, above all, the power to impeach a President was given to the House of Representatives, with the Senate sitting as a High Court when the trial should have been ordered.

It was intended, in the admirable arrangement outlined by our national creators, that these branches — the legislative, executive, and judicial — should be entirely independent of each other. Least of all was it anticipated that the President should become the important factor in the Government. In the early days of our history, the line of demarcation was so well defined as to cause no forebodings for the future. Unfortunately, in the evolution of our Government, the executive has been gradually gaining an ascendancy over the legislative and judicial. The pivot

upon which we revolve as a nation is no longer the Capitol, where the people's representatives assemble, but the White House, where one man sits in almost supreme power.

It is not my purpose to discuss the authority exercised by the President under what are termed the war powers of the Constitution, although the field is a most inviting one. We have seen the President become, under the all-embracing phrase of "war power," the autocratic ruler of hundreds of thousands of people in Cuba and of millions of people in the Philippine Islands. He has appointed and removed officials without asking the cooperation of the Senate; he has framed tariff schedules independently of congressional action; he has established governments at his own will and pleasure. Congress seems to have abdicated. After the purchase of Louisiana by President Jefferson, Congress delegated to him authority to govern the newly-acquired territory. Similar legislation was suggested in the present Congress with regard to the Philippine Islands; but all action was paralyzed, because the Administration has extended its staying hand, until at last the President was compelled to ask Congress to relieve him from the onerous burden of executive government. Meantime, the laws promulgated by the Taft commission in the Philippine Islands declare that they are enacted "by the authority of the President of the United States," a phrase hitherto unknown in our history. Only recently Congress refused to restrain the importation of liquor into those islands — a traffic which is assuming enormous proportions — because the executive authority was admitted to be supreme.

Engrossed with commercial pursuits, and less responsive than ever before to the demands of representative government, the people accept this situation without protest. They regard it as the inevitable and unavoidable sequence of the war with Spain, which not only disturbed the equilibrium of the world, but opened to us new vistas of power, and thus stunned us into accepting without question many conditions which heretofore would have been seriously opposed. It is true that this acquiescence is, in a large degree, due to the deserved confidence reposed in the present executive by the people. The old adage, "The king can do no harm," is popularly applied to President McKinley; and there is no reason to apprehend that the trust will be betrayed.

But, as I have already stated, I do not propose to discuss the exercise of the war powers of the President — powers so vast and autocratic as to thrust a new word, "imperialism," into our political vocabulary. I desire, rather, to call attention to the manner in which the power of the President is growing through causes which operate daily, and which are

not accidental and extraneous, like the sudden and unexpected acquisition of territories and peoples beyond the seas. I want to make clear to the readers of *THE FORUM*, as it is in my own mind, the domination of the President in national affairs.

The lines along which the legislative, executive, and judicial divisions of the Government were laid down are no longer equal as to themselves nor parallel as to each other. The legislative and judicial are merging toward the executive. The appointment of the federal judiciary is entirely in the hands of the executive, as, to be sure, it has always been; but no intelligent man needs to be informed that instances are unhappily becoming only too frequent where the tenor of a forthcoming legal decision can be accurately predicted through a knowledge of the political complexion of the court. Even as I write, the Senate has just confirmed, after considerable opposition, the appointment of a son of an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court to be attorney-general of Porto Rico, when the Court has under consideration a decision of vital concern to the Administration. The son of another Justice of the Supreme Court has just been promoted in the army over the heads of many of his fellow-officers. In the legislative branch of the Government, it is the executive which influences, if it does not control, the action of Congress; while the power originally vested in the executive alone has increased to an extent of which the framers of the Constitution had no prophetic vision.

It is not difficult to discover the secret of executive power. A golden stream flows through the White House to the remotest corners of the United States. Its source is the national treasury. To the President of the United States is given the opportunity to divert a good part of this stream where and whither he will — into the pockets, generally, of his personal friends, but invariably to the financial benefit of his political supporters. If money is the lever that rules the world, the President can dispense it with a largess that is startling. Picture, for instance, the President standing beside the public vaults, with one arm plunged elbow-deep into the overflowing treasury, while the other is distributing the golden store to a greedy horde of eager men! Postmasters, collectors of customs, revenue officials, marshals, attorneys, consuls, foreign ministers — all these and more are among the recipients of the President's bounty. The only check is the approval of the United States Senate; and the members of that body, knowing that their constituents are drinking deeply of the golden stream, rarely interpose an objection.

There is no occasion to deal in generalities. The records of the

Departments at Washington present accurate detail of the number of offices which are directly filled by the President, with the amount of their annual salaries. Let me present this information as I have gathered it from official sources:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| State Department— | |
| 318 consular and diplomatic appointments..... | \$1,000,000. |
| Treasury Department— | |
| 743 customs, revenue, marine hospital, etc. | 617,355. |
| Post-office Department— | |
| 4,015 Postmasters..... | 6,981,000. |
| Interior Department— | |
| 747 Pension officials, land office agents, etc..... | 1,907,640. |
| Department of Justice— | |
| Judges, attorneys, marshals, etc. | 1,126,000. |
| Total..... | \$11,671,996. |

In this compact form is presented the official outlet for over \$11,-000,000 annually, every cent of which goes to the persons whom the President personally selects, or to whose appointment, solicited by senators and representatives, he gives his approval. This list is, however, by no means complete, even as to the Departments named. It omits entirely the War and Navy Departments, because of the difficulty in accurately stating the number of commissions annually issued. Suffice it to say that in the last two years the President has been authorized to add enormously to the list of Army and Navy officers; and the amount paid out to persons thus named by him will reach into the millions of dollars. It is a fair and conservative estimate — taking into consideration the \$12,000,000 already specified, and adding thereto the military and naval list, the unclassified appointments, and the new offices created each year — to say that the President annually offers to certain favored individuals the sum of \$20,000,000, a total distribution of \$80,000,000 during his term of office.

It needs no argument to prove that the hand which controls this enormous output of the national wealth is a hand of power. The spoils of office which figured so largely in Jackson's administration were as a tiny rivulet compared with the mighty patronage of a President at the present time. It is, therefore, a question worthy of consideration whether this tremendous power has been or could be used to accomplish definite results desired by a President of the United States. Can it actually affect the vital interests of the country? Is it, in reality, the lever of influence which it seems to be?

These questions must be answered affirmatively. The extremes to

which Andrew Jackson resorted in his effort to dominate and control Congress, during his great fight against the United States Bank, are naturally recalled; and the severe condemnation of his methods by his biographer, Professor Sumner, of Yale, might well be quoted here if it were necessary to delve so deeply into the past for appropriate illustrations. These, however, may be found much closer at hand. When President Cleveland came into office on March 4, 1893, he found upon the statute books a law which provided for the purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver each month. Whether this act was responsible for the financial troubles which were, even then, afflicting the country, was an open question; but in the mind of the President there was no doubt whatever. In the message submitted by him to Congress at the beginning of the extraordinary session which he convened, he laid all the blame at the door of the statute and strongly urged its repeal. He did not confine his interest in this repeal to the words of his message, which was his Constitutional limitation; but the observer of events in Washington saw the executive bring to bear upon the legislative branch of the Government an amount of personal pressure unequalled, perhaps, in the history of the Republic.

Even now one can recall how the emissaries of the President thronged the halls of Congress; how strange and remarkable conversions were wrought through influences which emanated from the White House, and which it was not politic to withstand. When the bill wiping the silver-purchasing law from the statute books went to the Senate, it did not command a majority of that body; but during the three months of acrimonious debate, the power of the executive was exerted to such an extent as to win the support of those senators whose votes were needed to accomplish the Presidential purpose. No one who is at all familiar with the inner history of that memorable and dramatic struggle will dispute these statements, which could be made specific by the recital of details in many instances which came under my personal knowledge. It is also no exaggeration to say that the power of the Administration threw the wavering scale in favor of the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain; while the history of the passage of the Porto Rican tariff bill is another instance, more recent still, where Congress bent its neck to the yoke of the President.

It may be argued that, in these cases of law and treaty and bill, the end justified the means. With those who offer this contention, I have no argument whatever. I simply insist that in three momentous contests, at least, the influence of the President has been successfully ex-

erted. If it may produce good, it may also be an agency of evil; the fact being that it almost invariably accomplishes the purpose for which it is exercised. Indeed, it has become a recognized axiom in Congress, and particularly in the Senate, that it is futile to oppose a President and his Administration. Grant triumphed over the cabal formed against him; Garfield, a man of ordinary calibre, relegated the brilliant Conkling to private life; and the men who led the defection from Cleveland, before the latter was entirely repudiated by his party, suffered for their temerity, Mr. Arthur Pue Gorman being among the number.

Men whose political life depends upon the distribution of federal offices to themselves or to their friends will cringe and bow before the executive who, with much adroitness, dangles the golden prizes just above their heads. This is human nature, much to be deplored, perhaps, but none the less real. It is this which enables a President to secure his renomination, despite the hostility of a strong minority in his party. The Minneapolis national convention of 1892, when Mr. Harrison was renominated through the efforts and votes of office-holders appointed by him, is a case in point.

Mr. Harrison was, however, defeated at the polls; and this brings us to a consideration of the other side of the question. The office-holders, while they can, and do, largely control the organization of their own party, are powerless when their field of operations is extended to the entire nation. Herein we find a limit to the power of the President. His appointees are certain to be, first of all, without influence over their political opponents; but, more than this, their success is a disturbing factor in their own ranks. The country is so large, and the number of men qualified and available for public office so great, that the percentage of the appointed must always be smaller than that of the disappointed. Jealousy and resentment rankle in the breasts of the unfortunates, and they wreak their silent, but effective, vengeance at the polls. The "outs" are always numerically greater than the "ins." With this restraining fact, coupled with an appreciation of the universal sentiment against a third term, and the knowledge that the distribution of office is rather a source of weakness than of strength to an Administration, there is no reason to fear that any President will ever be able to build up for himself an office-holding oligarchy, intent upon his perpetuation in the executive chair. There is no danger in that direction.

The insidious, but powerful, influence which any President can exercise over Congress through the dispensation of offices is, however, a matter worthy of serious consideration. It has been exercised in the

past, and it will be in the future, as long as senators and representatives are susceptible to favors and Presidents are anxious to accomplish certain results. I admit that, with the modern tendency toward a centralized government, a remedy for the evil is not instantly apparent. Perhaps a step in the right direction would be the adoption of a Constitutional amendment making a President ineligible to reelection, with a term of either four or six years. It is possible that senators and representatives would become less obedient if they knew that the Presidential hand would soon lose its gift-dispensing quality. If this plan be not feasible, American statesmen might well undertake the task of devising some other means of curtailing the President's growing power; for the distribution of millions and millions of dollars from the national treasury should not be reposed in one man, even though that man be the President of the United States.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.

LABOR CONDITIONS IN SWITZERLAND.

OUT of a total population of 3,144,741, about 1,300,000 live on the profits of commerce and industry. Some 200,000 are employers and independent workers; and of the 421,000 wage-workers, half are occupied in establishments employing five or more, and coming under the provisions of the factory inspection law. In 1882 the number of such factories reported was 2,527, with 129,120 laborers, which number had grown by December 31, 1899, to 5,911 establishments, employing 240,978 workers. During the early period of inspection, it was considered sufficient to visit each factory once in two years; but now at least one visit per year is required, and it is not rare that the same establishment receives several inspections in the course of twelve months. In fact, a portion of the apparent increase in the number of laborers is attributed to the more thorough work of the corps of inspectors during the last few years.

The country is divided into three sections for the purpose of inspection: (1) Zurich, San Gallen, etc.; (2) Berne to Geneva; and (3) Lucerne, Basle, etc. However, as the reports of the various sections are neither unified nor drawn up on the same plan, it is difficult to find the corresponding results for the entire population. In the last report, that for 1898-99, there are noted as working in the factories of the leading industries: 45,567 in metals and machines; 38,532 in cotton; 32,807 in silk; 21,338 in clocks, watches, and jewelry; and 12,071 in embroidery. Some years ago, a special investigation showed that 59.5 per cent of the factory workers were males, although the population numbered 100,000 more females than males. Of the workers, 4.3 per cent were from 14 to 18 years of age; 76.7 per cent from 18 to 50 years; and 9 per cent above 50 years of age. However, 18 per cent of the population had passed the fiftieth year, and many of these were doubtless laborers in retirement, either living on their savings or kept by their children. As a fact, the mortality among the entire population is so low, less than 19 in 1,000, while the number of births is relatively so large, 29.4 in 1,000 (1898), that no further proof is required of the good sanitary condition,

not only of the country at large, but also of the factories and homes. Inasmuch as the deaths by accidents of all kinds are only 3 per cent of the total number of deaths, it is plain that those among laborers through accidents in the course of their employment are exceedingly rare.

Switzerland offers one special feature of the labor movement which elsewhere has received but little or no attention, namely, home industry with modern appliances. Under this form, agricultural and manufacturing work are often successfully combined, and the members of a family working together escape the rigors of the inspection law. This is not the place to enter into a consideration of the theory of labor; but it is worth while to call attention to the fact that, while the labor organizations in Switzerland, as well as in other countries, are crying aloud for the eight-hour work-day, many thousands of Swiss voluntarily subject themselves to work from early morning to late in the evening; and the constantly growing deposits in the savings banks are the visible result.

In the district of Zurich, for example, it is estimated that 26,886 persons are thus occupied in the silk industry alone; while in the neighborhood of San Gallen 60 per cent of the embroidery machines are kept running in the homes. Another canton reports more than half of its 12,000 straw plaiters occupied with home work. Nor are these the only examples. In watch and clock making, tobacco work, knitting, and various branches of weaving, favorable results are announced from home industry. These results are economic; and the question remains whether the health of the workers is not thereby impaired. As yet, no conclusive answer to that question has been given; but the willingness of the people to work long hours at home is cited as one of the principal reasons for refusing to amend the factory law and to shorten the hours of labor permitted in workshops.

As the country is made up of twenty-five cantons which are more or less independent of the central government and of each other, Swiss legislation somewhat resembles our own in its diversity. In two respects, however, the little Republic has gone much further than we have in the way of centralization; namely, in a constitutional provision requiring obligatory primary education, and in a uniform labor law. The execution of these laws is largely confided to the cantonal authorities, who may more or less neglect them where public opinion does not demand their enforcement. But their existence on the statute books, and the repeated animadversions of the central authorities, not to mention sectional rivalry in the examinations for military service, which have been a powerful stimulant, keep the standard before the eyes of the people,

and produce in the long run their effect. On the other hand, the more advanced cantons are at liberty to improve on the federal laws; and they not infrequently do so, with advantage not only to their own inhabitants, but indirectly to the State at large.

The Federal Constitution of 1874 declares in Art. 27: "The cantons provide for sufficient primary instruction, which shall be exclusively under State control. The same is obligatory, and, in the public schools, gratis." Under these provisions, the State offers to its children not only a little book-learning, but also some instruction in the practical affairs of life — to the girls a knowledge of household duties, and to the boys the acquisition of a manual trade. Besides an unusual development of training schools, the old idea of apprenticeship has been revived under new and better conditions, and is producing excellent results. The first improvement in this direction was inaugurated by the city of Basle, in 1877. Apprentice examinations were organized and found to be of such advantage that the other cantons of German Switzerland soon followed the example. Later the work was systematized and rendered as far as possible uniform throughout that portion of the country, under the auspices of the *Gewerbeverein* (Industrial Union), which appoints a Central Examination Committee of seven members, holding office for three years.

Working in accord with the local authorities, this committee appoints expert examiners for the various sections, who conduct the work in person. Each apprentice is required to furnish a sample piece of work in his trade, executed under inspection, then to perform given tasks under the eyes of the examiners, and finally to pass an oral examination on the subject of his trade, — materials, tools, machines, their names, characteristics, and uses — and a school examination in reading, writing, arithmetic, simple book-keeping, and drawing, when that belongs to the trade. The results of these examinations are published yearly, and the names of those examined inscribed in a General Swiss Register, together with the trade, and the examination mark received — "very good," "good," "sufficient," or "insufficient." The objects produced by the candidates are placed on public exhibition, for a few days, with the names of the maker, his master, and the mark received for the examination. Girls are admitted to certain trades, and expert women are eligible as examiners. The diploma is accepted by employers as a guarantee of good preparation for future work, and the results have fully justified the expectation.

By means of government subsidies and private gifts, employers who give careful training to apprentices are paid; while the best learners receive prizes and distinctions which practically assure their immediate

employment under favorable circumstances. Commencing with the modest number of 14 examinations in 1877, the work has grown to 1,104 examinations in 1899, with a grand total of 11,599. Those most interested in the work are now endeavoring to have the examinations declared obligatory by law in the various cantons.

In the same Federal Constitution there were introduced articles authorizing the central government to pass laws regulating the employment of children in factories, also the hours of work of grown persons, and to institute rules for the protection of laborers in industries dangerous to health and safety. Acting under this authority, the law of March 23, 1877, was passed. This requires in general the adoption of all the measures gained by experience to protect the health of laborers and to prevent accidents, as far as circumstances will permit.

Every manufacturer is required to have fixed rules for his factory, regarding the organization of the work, general conduct, conditions of entrance and going out, and the payment of wages. Before these rules can go into effect, they must be submitted to the cantonal authorities, who consult the opinion of the workers before ratifying them. Fourteen days' notice of discharge or of intention to quit work must be given, except in special cases duly provided for; and the pay must be made in cash every two weeks, and in the factory, also with certain admitted exceptions. The day's work is limited to eleven hours, with a full hour's noon rest, and on Saturday to ten hours; and to prevent chicanery under the rotating system or night work, the day's work must commence not earlier than 5 A.M. in summer and 6 A.M. in winter, and end not later than 8 P.M. Furthermore, the hours must be reported to the local authorities and regulated by the public clock. Necessary exceptions are provided for, but in general the provision is duly safeguarded. As to women workers, there are excellent provisions not only forbidding night and Sunday work, but giving them an extra half-hour at noon, when they have the care of a household.

For children, all factory work is forbidden up to the age of fourteen years; and from that age to sixteen, the combined time devoted to school, religious instruction, and work must not exceed eleven hours per day. Employers cannot plead as excuse ignorance of age, and thus escape responsibility. Infractions of the law by employers are punishable by fines up to five hundred francs; and, in case of repetition, imprisonment up to three months may be added. A partial investigation in 1868 found 9,540 children under sixteen years of age working in 664 factories. Of these children, 488 were under twelve years of age. Some of them

dragged through thirteen hours of daily toil; while others under sixteen years slaved fifteen hours out of the twenty-four.

Fortunately, the law has reduced this evil to very small proportions, and every year sees an improvement. The reports of the inspectors for 1898-99 do not mention the exact number of under-age children found at work, except in the second district, where there were thirty-two cases brought to light, of which thirteen were in the canton of Tessin and ten in Geneva — cantons with many Italian laborers, among whom it is difficult to find the necessary papers as to age. In 1897 there were eighty-six children under age found in the employ of a scheming woman, who revenged herself on their removal by a violent and untruthful publication against the inspector who revealed her method of gaining lucre. In the first district, the inspector complains of the fact of under-age children being at work, without giving an idea of their number; and in the third district it is stated that the cases are numerous.

Complaints are also made that children are allowed to "play" in the factories; and if this is not a ruse to cover work, the danger is none the less great from exposing the little ones to injury from machinery. The law here does not seem to cover the matter as does the French law, which forbids under any circumstances the presence of children in the factories. Many of the cases, however, are those of children between thirteen and fourteen years of age, arising from the fact that some of the cantonal schools finish the primary instruction at thirteen, and that the parents do not know what to do with the children for the intervening year before the legal age of entering on factory work. The question of child labor is one of such importance for the future health, strength, and intelligence of the population, that it is subjected not only to the inspection of the regular authorities, but also to the friendly watchfulness of the councils of *prud'hommes*, the trades union, certain benevolent societies, and the commissioners of apprenticeship. In this manner it is possible to enforce general obedience to the law, and at the same time to aid in many ways the early years in a life's calling.

In western Switzerland, a new departure was made in the canton of Neuchâtel by the law of November 21, 1890, regulating in detail the matter of apprenticeship. Employers are forbidden to accept an apprentice without a written contract detailing the conditions of engagement and work, and signed by both the employer and a parent or guardian of the apprentice. An official programme regulates the details of apprenticeship for fifty-six trades; limiting the work of apprentices under fifteen years of age to ten hours per day, and fixing the duration of apprentices-

ship, which averages about three years, though varying from one year for ironing of linen, for example, to six years for the four branches coming under the head of spring-making, in the manufacture of clocks and watches. Diplomas are awarded in the name of the Department of Industry and Agriculture, and prizes are given for special excellence. These prizes consist either of a sum of money, deposited in the savings bank, or of books, instruments, or tools of the trade.

So great has been the success of this movement that in eight years the number of registered apprentices has far more than doubled. Neighboring cantons have adopted similar measures; and the Geneva law of November 25, 1899, requires not only a written contract of apprenticeship, but its registering in the Department of Commerce and Industry. In 1898 the number of apprentices in the canton was 1,987, of whom 390 were preparing for banking and commerce, and 1,597 for the various branches of industry. Among the latter were included 681 girls, preparing for a variety of callings open to women.

Although the factory law has been in existence for more than two decades, its administration has been improved from year to year, and the benefits of its provisions have been constantly extended. On December 13, 1897, new prescriptions were issued for the general regulation of all factory buildings to be constructed or remodelled. Before work thereon can be commenced, the plans in detail must be submitted to the proper authorities, and approved or modified to meet their requirements; and a copy as finally approved remains with the government, for future comparison with the work as carried out. Cellars can be used as workrooms under exceptional circumstances only, and then the privilege is restricted by conditions stipulated by the government. All workrooms must be at least three metres high, and contain at least ten cubic metres for each person employed therein. In case the floor surface covers from 100 to 200 square metres, the ceiling must be three and a half metres high, and, if the rooms are larger, four metres high. Sufficient windows and ventilating appliances are provided for; also lavatories separated from the workrooms, with doors closing automatically, containing ventilating shafts of at least twenty centimetres diameter, and reaching above the roof higher than the highest skylight. For certain industries baths are required in the factories; and every establishment must have a dining-room for its workers, unless good reasons can be shown for dispensing with it.

Besides these general regulations, there are special rules governing trades dangerous to the health of the workers. For instance, in tobacco factories special provisions are made regarding the doors and windows,

an entire change of air being required twice a day; also for exceptionally solid and compact floors, which must be washed or wiped with a wet cloth at least once a day, while the walls and ceilings must be whitewashed every year. The laborers in lead factories must have working-clothes worn in the factory only, and change them for clean ones every week. They are not allowed to eat in any workroom, and are recommended to scrub their teeth with warm water and to wash their hands with soap and warm water before each meal. Furthermore, they are obliged to take a warm bath weekly, with special attention to the scalp and the beard.

In printing offices and type foundries the floors are to be washed daily; and the tables, windows, furniture, and all projections where dust may lodge receive like treatment twice a week. Openings must be so arranged as to permit of continual ventilation, and a thorough change of air must be made at noon and evening; while twelve cubic metres of space are required for each workman, in place of ten cubic metres, considered sufficient in other occupations. Expectorating on the floor is forbidden; and each workroom must be provided with a sufficient number of spittoons, full of wet sand, and carefully emptied from time to time. Smoking is strictly prohibited, as is also working in the street and home clothes.

Besides being guaranteed a comfortable building to work in, the Swiss factory-hand is also assured by law against the arbitrary changing of rules by his employer, as he is bound to receive, on being engaged, a copy of the rules governing the work in the establishment. If the employee breaks the rules, he may be fined by the employer up to one-half of his day's wages; or, for a grave offence, he may be immediately discharged, with the loss of a week's wages, which amount the employer is always permitted to keep back, as a reminder to the worker of the risk of disobedience. But the employer's risk is still greater; for the workman can appeal to a court of justice against an employer who breaks his own rules, and the latter is liable not only to a fine up to 500 francs, but to imprisonment up to three months, in case of repetition of the offence. This question has been finally decided by the highest authorities, so that there is no doubt in regard to the matter. The employer has sufficient power over the worker, who, accordingly, is not subject to further punishment by legal process; but the worker, being personally powerless against the capitalist, can appeal to the government for justice, and have called to account an offending employer, who, because of his more favorable position and supposed higher intelligence, is more severely punished than the worker for non-observance of duty.

Many employers object to the work of the government inspectors, by which their lack of good faith or their positive injustice toward their workers can be revealed to the public and the authorities, in a manner not to be frowned down or ignored, as frequently happens when similar accusations are made by the employees themselves. One employer went so far as to appeal to the highest authorities against an inspector, accusing him of exceeding his powers in helping a wounded worker to secure his lawful indemnity, and in examining the relation of the men to the sick fund of the establishment. Instead, however, of receiving any consolation from the authorities, this appeal was answered by an order of the Federal Council, dated February 5, 1886, declaring, among other things, that it is the duty of the inspector to see justice done, whether on one side or on the other.

A priori, it appears scarcely possible that men of means, position, and intelligence would stoop to perjury in order to save a sum of money, and thereby defraud a poor, suffering man, whose family may be wanting the necessities of life, while he is unable to work on account of injuries received while performing his duty toward his employer. Workers are often accused of tricks and untruthfulness to the employer's detriment, and some of them are doubtless guilty. But wrong on one side does not warrant injustice on the other, especially where the employer, by reason of his position, should show a good example. Yet, here it is publicly and officially declared that it is not a rare occurrence for employers to attempt by illegal means to defraud the workers of their legal rights.

Another kind of trick was also revealed, that of an employer who required his workers to be at their places ten to fifteen minutes before the legal time, both in the morning and after the noon rest, on the plea that it required that much time to get all the machines in running order, thus securing from them more than eleven hours of work per day. The men complained, and the government put into the factory its inspectors, who confirmed the fraud of the employer, that he was guilty not only of breaking the law limiting work to eleven hours per day, but at the same time of getting overwork out of his unfortunate employees without paying for it. Nor are such cases by any means rare. In the Report of the Labor Bureau for 1898 there are cited quite a number of methods adopted by employers to defraud workers of their legal rights.

In spite of the countless complaints against the despotism of capitalism, charging it with all the evils of the workers' lives, the facts revealed by labor inspectors prove that many of those evils are the direct result of the workingman's own ignorance, wilful neglect, or positive malice.

To begin with, parents often put their children to work where they will learn little or nothing, but will soonest gain small wages. A life of poorly paid drudgery is the almost inevitable result. On the other hand, by making some sacrifice in placing the children as apprentices to better trades, the whole future of the younger generation might be immeasurably brightened.

But even of their own welfare the workers are often criminally negligent. In some factories where special ventilating apparatus is installed it is utterly neglected; and the workers remain indifferent to the poisoned air they are constantly breathing. In others, they have deliberately put aside the apparatus prescribed for their protection; declaring that they "are not to be bossed," and threatening to leave if the government regulations are enforced. Where spittoons were introduced they purposely spat all round them; and where modern lavatories were provided, they maliciously broke them.

During the years 1898-99, there occurred in the first inspection district but sixteen strikes, and only two of these assumed any importance. In the one case, poorly paid book-binders struck for higher wages, knowing that their employers were especially prosperous; and in the other case, printers struck against a proposed reduction of twenty-five per cent in their wages. The strikes in the second district are reported also to have been of trifling significance, with the single exception of the carpenters' strike at Geneva. This commenced June 27, 1898, and might have been, it is asserted, easily arranged by arbitration. But the employers were obstinate, although the changes demanded by the men were only slight, and, moreover, just. In consequence, the strike lasted three weeks, causing direct losses to the workingmen calculated at 200,-000 francs, while the indirect losses, as usual, were also heavy. As to the third district, numerous insignificant strikes were reported, but only one of any importance, and that was quickly settled by the judicious efforts of a member of the cantonal government.

After elaborate preparation and lengthy discussions, a new law regarding strikes, originating in the question of wages, was passed by the canton of Geneva, in January, 1900. As the constitutionality of the law was immediately challenged, it required long months of legal procedure before the matter was finally settled in favor of the law; and hence the possible results of this innovation cannot yet be seen or judged. Nevertheless, as an experiment it is well worthy of consideration. Inasmuch as a very large proportion of strikes originate in a demand from employer or employee for a change of wages, this law essays to obviate

the difficulty by providing for the establishing of fixed tariffs of wages, by mutual consent or by arbitration, for definite periods of time, not exceeding five years. These conditions once established, the law provides that as long as such a tariff is in force, no general suspension of work may be declared, either by the employers or the workingmen, with a view to modifying the tariff. It also prescribes criminal punishment for every appeal by publication to quit work, in violation of the present law; and, moreover, it subjects the publisher and the printer to the same punishment as the instigators of the appeal.

The reporting inspector of the second district expresses the opinion that with a more perfect organization of labor there would be fewer strikes, that when all the workers shall be union men and march together, they will be able to make their voices heard. His conditions, however, exist only in the realm of the ideal; for, up to the present, while experience shows that the more unions there are the more those voices are heard; yet, they result in producing rather than in avoiding strikes. None the less it is true that labor organizations have contributed powerfully to the betterment of the workers' condition; and, if judiciously managed, they are capable of exercising a marked influence, not only on their material welfare, but also on their civic education. Opposed to the above inspector's opinion is that of M. Le Cointe, whose masterly "Inventaire des Institutions Economique et Sociales de la Suisse à la Fin du XIXme Siècle" was recently honored with a gold medal at Paris. He says that from the information received he finds that, while in general the relations between employer and employed are favorable, trouble is frequently caused by the influence of the labor unions, into which politics and party spirit too often penetrate.

The number of persons joined in labor unions throughout the country is between 50,000 and 60,000, of whom more than one-fourth are included in the General Swiss Labor Union. Next in numbers comes the Transport Union, with more than 13,000 members; and it is followed by the Gritli, with 11,000 members, but which is probably the most influential of all the labor organizations of Switzerland. It has 324 branches, distributed throughout all the cantons; possesses property to the value of a quarter of a million francs; and disposes of an annual revenue of over 75,000 francs. With 44,372 volumes in its libraries, and 940 newspapers and periodicals, other than its own publications, it offers to its members instruction in book-keeping, foreign languages, the principles of law, etc. It also furnishes amusements, together with instruction in gymnastics, instrumental and vocal music, and target shooting.

Founded in 1838, in the city of Geneva, the Grütli Union has passed through various phases of existence. In 1890 it attained its maximum membership of 16,391. As the public schools have improved it has become less important in instruction, but has changed gradually into a political organization, preparing petitions and bills, organizing campaigns, and propagating by all the means within its grasp the doctrines of socialism. *Pari passu* with this alteration has grown the love of amusement, so much so, that in 1899, while but 416 hours were devoted to foreign languages, 1,372 hours were given to declamation and the theatre, 63 hours to legal subjects, and 2,925 hours to singing. The old watchword of the Union, "Through learning to freedom," was excellent, forcibly recalling Christ's declaration: "The truth shall make you free." The new by-laws of 1893 state the object of the Union to be "the development of political and social progress in Switzerland, on the basis of socialistic democracy."

A systematic attempt to compile the wages of labor in Switzerland was made in 1895, but covers the wages paid in 1893. Among the trades, divided into fifteen categories and including more than 78,000 persons, the wages of 65,204 workers were ascertained. Of these, 1,563 received 1 franc or less per day; 3,946 earned more than 5 francs a day; while but the negligible number of 41 were paid more than 10 francs for a day's work. Among the 27,000 workers in cotton factories, 31.8 per cent earned but from 1.51 franc to 2 francs per diem. Working in silk, to clothe the rich and beautify their homes, 85.5 per cent of the 12,000 laborers earned 3.50 francs or less per day. For woollen goods the condition was still less favorable, 32 per cent working for wages between 1.51 franc and 2 francs a day. Running greater risks, but also receiving better pay, were the laborers in chemical works, of whom 24.5 per cent received from 3.51 to 4 francs a day. Of the workers in wood, 73.3 per cent received wages varying from 3.01 to 5 francs daily; and 57 per cent of the workers in metal earned within the same limits.

The Factory Inspection Report for 1898-99 furnishes some more recent figures on wages. Cotton spinners earn from 2.80 francs to 4 francs, with only a few who receive as high as 4.50 francs. Women weavers earn from 2.60 francs upward, and attain in some cases the maximum of 3.90 francs. But such is not the pay of all, or for every day, seeing that the average yearly earnings of these women is estimated at the modest sum of 642.50 francs. The present wages in the silk factories vary from 80 centimes for children to from 4 to 5 francs per day for the best women weavers. Men working embroidery machines are said to

prefer less work at 2.70 francs a day rather than to run four-row machines, by which their wages can be increased to 4 and even 7 francs a day. For machine embroidery, 2 francs a day is the general wage, while 3 francs a day is considered the average of the best paying establishments; but in house work cases are reported where an embroiderer, with an assistant to thread the needles, earns as high as 300 francs a month.

From a table of average wages for the first half of 1899, we learn that builders received as high as 55 centimes an hour; stone masons 5 to 6 francs a day; carpenters up to 50 centimes an hour; paper hangers 5 to 7 francs a day; coppersmiths the same; mechanics engaged in electrical work up to 70 centimes an hour; other mechanics 45 to 60 centimes an hour; and watchmakers 120 to 150 francs a month. Among railroad workers, the wages vary from 1,100 francs a year, for guards of crossings, to 5,100 francs, which is the highest price paid to engine-drivers.

Equally important as the question of wages is that of the living to be had therefor. What quality and quantity of food can the laborer procure for himself and family? And for what kind of lodgings can he afford to pay? Many of the Swiss workers live chiefly on bread and cheese, coffee, soup, and cider, tasting meat but twice a week, replacing it on other days with vegetables or macaroni, and frequently satisfying their hunger with fried potatoes. Employers are, however, gradually learning that better food means better work; and the consequence is that the custom of feeding the laborers in the factories is constantly gaining ground. Accordingly, some of the cases of extremely low wages noted above, as among the cotton-spinners, is in large measure compensated for by a better-prepared and more ample table than the same workers would enjoy if they were paid higher wages and were left to their own expedients. One proprietor goes so far as to provide food for all hands five times a day, including two meals with meat dishes.

Unfortunately, the boarding offered by employers is not infrequently let out by contract to unscrupulous persons who furnish food not only unnutritious in character, but hotly spiced, in order to produce thirst, and thus induce the workers to buy drinks, on which the profits are large. Sometimes, also, the right of furnishing the table of the hands is given to the foremen as a part of their perquisites. On the other hand, the laborers themselves often prefer food of an inferior quality, as in the case of cotton-spinners, who spend a large portion of their wages for sweetmeats, and refuse to drink the best of milk which the proprietor arranged to have brought to the factory at the lowest wholesale price. In another case, an offer of buttermilk at three centimes the litre was

treated with utter contempt by bloodless women workers, who preferred to spend their wages on knick-knacks.

As to lodgings, the same complaints are made in Switzerland as elsewhere, that their cost is not only out of proportion to the wages earned, but also relatively far dearer than that of the higher-priced apartments. Moreover, there is a decided lack of proper lodgings at prices within the reach of the working class. Efforts to improve the situation have not been lacking, especially by employers; and some of the local governments have been led to inaugurate elaborate plans for housing the poor. As early as 1894 an official investigation showed the existence of 2,029 special houses for workingmen, containing 5,910 apartments, with 29,-561 occupants. Of these buildings, 66 belonged to the city of Berne, 356 were the property of societies, and the remainder had been erected by employers. The returns on the capital invested in such dwellings vary from less than 2 per cent, in the case of some employers' cottages, to 10 per cent, the profits of the Basler Bauverein; although in general they are from 3 to 4 per cent.

Of late the movement has made rapid progress. Not only has the city of Berne more than doubled the number of such edifices, but Neuchâtel has followed with 23 houses containing 210 rooms; Zurich has entered on the work; Lausanne bought ground for a similar experiment in 1898; and Geneva has not only guaranteed the Savings Bank for 2,000,000 francs in a similar undertaking, but, since 1896, it has been engaged on a series of workingmen's houses, on its own plans, whose combined cost is estimated at 2,024,000 francs. In general, the so-called twin houses — little cottages of two apartments each, with a garden attached — have been found the most favorable, though Geneva is constructing four-story tenements.

Numerous have been the efforts to regulate and improve the sanitary condition of the lodgings of the poor; and Dr. Schnetzler, the expert of Lausanne, maintains that in this respect Switzerland is superior to Germany, Austria, and France. Herein the different cantons are very unequal, both in their legislation and in their practice. Among the interesting experiments has been that of the city of Basle, whose elaborate law of 1895 provided, for example, that every house must have at least one fire-proof stairway, and that no new house should be higher than the width of the street on which it fronts, with a maximum height of twenty metres, with not more than five stories, and with no living or sleeping rooms in cellars, etc.

On April 5, 1900, an inspection law was passed by the same city

for houses to rent, and including all the sleeping-rooms of domestics, house laborers, and apprentices. This law provides for the creation of a house commission and a corps of house inspectors, empowered to visit houses without previous notice; to see to the cleanliness of the premises subject to inspection; to order not only the required cleaning, but also repairs, and, in extreme cases, the vacating of the rooms or premises unfit for habitation. It goes even further, and makes provision for loaning money without interest to owners unable financially to comply with the law's exigencies; for reimbursing proprietors of houses where the required changes would prove a too heavy burden; and also, where necessary, for expropriating constructions not otherwise to be brought within the conditions of the law.

So great were the innovations proposed by this law, and so severe the restrictions on the privacy of the home, not to mention the probable financial difficulties to be created, that the referendum was demanded. When exercised, it repudiated the action of the legislators. As it has been found in many civilized countries that it pays to support the cost of general cleanliness and sanitary regulations, the day is probably not far distant when the more enlightened cities will put in operation some such law as this one so lately rejected by the burghers of Basle.

Among modern efforts to lessen the sum of human misery, insurance in its various branches has occupied a very important place. Beginning with the idea of adding to the comfort of the rich, it has now reached that stage of development where it has become practically a necessity of the poor. From a purely voluntary measure of foresight by the individual, it is rapidly passing to the universal, compulsory care of the State. Switzerland has been swept into the general current, but has rowed her boat after her own fashion. The Swiss employer bears a large responsibility for accidents to his workers, and in the years 1897-98 paid damages therefor aggregating 2,700,277 francs. As early as 1855 the Basle canton had a law providing for the institution of an assistance fund in every district, to which contribution by all journeymen workmen was made obligatory. In 1885 the canton of San Gallen made an experiment in forced insurance for all resident citizens. The city of Berne passed a law in 1893 establishing insurance for those out of work, which costs the city heavily, but relieves in winter a vast amount of misery. The next year San Gallen followed with a law of obligatory insurance against unavoidable idleness, but found the enforcement of the law so difficult, and its working so burdensome, that after two years the experiment was given up as a failure.

Finally, the Federal Government passed the law of October 5, 1899, known as the "Law of Insurance against Sickness and Accidents, and of Military Insurance." It was a most elaborate piece of legislation, containing four hundred articles, and providing for the compulsory insurance of all persons above fourteen years of age, working for others, with certain exceptions. The country was to be divided into insurance districts (*arrondissements*) containing at least 2,000 inhabitants each, and administered by the cantons. Provision was also made for voluntary insurance, but on the condition that the person must be under forty-five years of age and in good health. Those insured were divided into ten classes, according to the amount of their daily earnings; and their delegates were to take part in the administration of the work, in conjunction with the proper public officials. The Confederation was to support the expense of running the elaborate machinery provided for, and pay one-fifth of the premiums. Furthermore, there was to be erected a *Tribunal des Assurances*, with seven judges and five substitutes, invested with extraordinary powers. Methods of insurance and amounts of payment to the insured or their heirs were stipulated with minuteness, and severe punishments prescribed for fraud.

No sooner was the law passed than it raised a storm of protests, answered by a chorus of warm defence, and the referendum was called for. The latter resulted in the rejection of the law, May 20, 1900. Among the objections offered may be cited several, as, for example, that the resulting burden of its application would fall far too heavily on certain classes, and ruin the small manufacturer, the shopkeeper, and the independent laborer, of whom, as we have already seen, there exist so many in the country. Moreover, it placed the foreigner on the same footing as the Swiss, and thus offered a premium to the poor and lazy of the neighboring countries, without any return whatever to the Swiss should they emigrate to those countries.

In numerous cases, the new law left the victims of accidents in a worse condition than the old law establishing the employers' liability to pay rather heavy damages in favor of the laborer; and at the same time the new law required the workingman to pay a heavier premium of insurance. Worst of all the faults, perhaps, were: (1) that the law was to the advantage of the careless and the drunkard rather than to that of the conscientious hard worker; and (2) that it provided berths for an army of parasitic bureaucrats. A distinguished jurist of the country told me that he and many others voted against it, principally because of its intricacies, which made it practically impossible of execution.

Nevertheless, the idea of compulsory insurance is in the air, and the principle is accepted by an ever-increasing number; so that the project, far from being killed by the rejection of the law of 1899, simply made place for the continued discussion and study of the matter. Among the new plans proposed, it may be interesting to glance a moment at that of Louis Ullmo. This project is remarkable from the fact that it would not commence obligatory insurance with the intelligent, prudent laborers, who by careful saving could make provision for the day of misfortune or for helpless old age, but that it would build a social pyramid of the insured, beginning with the poorest, the tramps, the professional paupers, as well as those reduced to misery by misfortune.

Says the author: "The insurance of the destitute, providing for old age, sickness, and accident, such is the aim of obligatory insurance." This insurance he would have paid out of the public revenue, on the principle that every individual may possibly fall into misfortune, and that, therefore, in the days of his prosperity he should contribute to the common fund of insurance, on which some day he may have to call for aid. Above the destitute, this scheme places the laborers, clerks, and small employers, and these he would have united in mutual insurance societies; while those in easy circumstances, forming the top of the pyramid, should insure themselves at will in independent companies, as at present. Such is the project which, amplified and supported by specious arguments, was recently offered to the Swiss public in attractive pamphlet form — a project founded on a spirit of large charity, but which overlooks the innate defects of human nature, and deprives the masses of the impulse to honest effort, which only the feeling of personal responsibility affords.

In contrast to such a proposed premium on pauperism, the canton of Neuchâtel passed the law of March 29, 1898, which declares its object to be to insure under the most favorable conditions, and to encourage and popularize provident habits by means of a judicious and valid organization. Three kinds of insurance are provided for: (1) life; (2) life annuities payable monthly after the age of sixty years; and (3) mixed, that is, life insurance in case the insured dies before the age of sixty, or annuity after reaching that age, or capitalizing the annuity on arriving at sixty. The benefits of this State insurance are limited to sums varying from 100 to 5,000 francs for life insurance, and from 30 to 100 francs monthly payments for the annuities. Among the exceptional features of this system may be noted that no one under eighteen years of age is eligible, and that no account is taken of the condition of the health of

the insured, with the exception that those in poor health cannot benefit from the insurance until after paying premiums for three years. But in case they die before the expiration of that period, the sums paid by them will be reimbursed to their heirs.

Furthermore, when a person once insured stops payments, he does not lose all that he has hitherto paid. On the contrary, the canton of Neuchâtel, in such cases, calculates the capitalized value of the sums paid, and places that to the credit of the insured, to be paid to his heirs in case of death, or to himself if he reached sixty years of age. The cantonal government pays the expenses of administration, also the extra risk of admitting those not in good health; and it furthermore pays from five to twenty per cent of the premiums, according to circumstances, of the sums insured up to 500 francs capital and 30 francs monthly payment of annuities.

The law went into effect February 1, 1899, and the first report of its operation, dated September 22, 1900, has just appeared in print. Under the provisions of the law, five local mutual insurance companies turned over their policies and their funds, amounting nominally to 681,-259 francs, to the new government institution. The premiums due for the year on all the insured amounted to 166,804 francs; interest on capital, 17,042 francs; and the government subvention was 96,406 francs. Payments to insured and their heirs amounted to 133,714 francs; and the cost of the first installation, furniture, etc., with recognized losses on the funds of the mutual insurance companies, were all placed in the profit and loss account. Yet the net profits of the eleven months' operation were 57,543 francs, which sum was added to the reserve. After the reserve has attained certain proportions, the surplus is to be applied to the reduction of the premiums to be paid by the insured.

On December 31, 1899, the number of life insurance policies was 7,971, aggregating 6,722,757 francs, including 3,410 policies of 500 francs, and 3,781 of 1,000 francs each. Of mixed policies there were but 627, aggregating 996,379 francs. But it should be remarked that the law permits the change from one kind of insurance to another; and the experience of the first year goes to show that many of the insured will take advantage of this feature, to capitalize their insurance on arriving at the age of sixty years. For annuities, there were only 28 policies, calling for monthly payments aggregating 1,290 francs.

WALTER B. SCAIFE.

THE SUPERINTENDENT FROM THE PRIMARY TEACHER'S POINT OF VIEW.

THE ways in which a superintendent can hinder or help a primary teacher are many. That a superintendent would intentionally hinder any teacher is, however, unworthy of a moment's notice. Nevertheless, the hindering ways are distressing and multifarious; and the only consolation lies in the fact that no one man has ever yet been able to compass them all. But let us particularize.

In the first place, there is *the superintendent with a hobby*. A large percentage of our superior officers ride a gayly caparisoned, dappled steed that gallops industriously and gracefully from September to June without getting anywhere. Having selected the primary department as the best training ground, he brings in his hobby and winds it up. Sadder still, he keeps it wound up.

By a system of reasoning bearing his private monogram our superintendent has arrived at the conclusion that arithmetic, for example, is the central subject about which all other studies group and find their true relation. The primary teacher receives her instructions accordingly. She must twist and turn every subject — reading, language, phonics, art, or science — until she is able to discover some attributes of quantity or magnitude, or both. She must do this regardless of their obscurity or their remoteness from the central point in the lesson. The numerical attributes must be dragged forth, and the children set to find the relations existing between them. They are to lisp in numbers whether they come or not.

Their efforts at art — the crude little drawings done in impossible colors, so dear to the heart of the teacher — are an offence and an abomination to this superintendent. He will have none of these drawings, he avows, "because they are neither true nor exact." There must be no idle wanderings in the field of fancy, where the lilies and daisies run riot and smother the sturdy seeds of accuracy he has sown.

In music he requieres the pupils to give with absolute correctness and oily glibness the relative values of notes down to the hemi-demi-semi-quaver: they must beat the time with an emphasis and precision

which the superintendent can recognize afar off. It matters not about their strident tones and lack of expression. The mathematical ideas must be developed first, and the others will develop spontaneously. If they shouldn't happen to do so, it is of no consequence. The one thing needful is being done — the children are preparing to meet a world that measures much and carols little.

It is hard to leave the hobbyist right here without saying some good things about him; but we must pass on to consider the ways of his colleague, *the experimenter* — the superintendent who has no hobby, but is making strenuous efforts to find one. Most likely he is a graduate of some higher institution of learning. He flourishes a crackling diploma and jingles medals galore for football and oratory; but the great requisite, pedagogical insight, he has never come in sight of, not even at long range. A tactful primary teacher can manage a superintendent with one hobby, without serious inconvenience to herself or permanent injury to her pupils; but when it comes to serving under a hobby hunter, or chronic experimenter, the case is much less favorable.

A teacher so situated was once asked if her superintendent had as yet succeeded in finding the primary panacea.

"No," she replied, wearily. "He is as restless and fanciful as a bantam hunting its first nest." And then she went on to describe their preliminary faculty meeting and the superintendent's inaugural address. How he impressed upon them the grave responsibility resting on the primary teacher, who must lay the corner-stone of the pupil's future career, and build the foundation of twelve, possibly fifteen, years of scholastic work! How he urged them to select their materials with the greatest care! How he besought them to build upon the solid rock, to be thoughtful, steadfast, and kind to these confiding, innocent babes, fresh from their mothers' loving arms for — "Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." There were tears in his classic eyes.

He said all that, and straightway turned that teacher's little kingdom into an experimental station, as if these "confiding, innocent babes" were so many incubated chicks, or Belgian hares, or scared rabbits. Having missed the main issue himself, he fell an easy prey to all the educational theories afloat. One week he had the teacher put numbers first on the programme, because he had just read that the reasoning faculties were brightest in the early morning. The next week he read that memory held the boards from 9 A.M. until 2 P.M., at which latter hour the imprisoned reason stalked forth and reigned till the sun went down. The programme was changed again.

At another time he appeared before the long-suffering teacher with an expression such as Columbus wore when he touched San Salvador. He had discovered that no child was able to make the proper associations for more than one new word a day. For proof he showed her an article in an obscure publication, and bade her read it. "It was sound," he said. "It was all sound," she thought. To carry out the theory of that stray article, he requested that thereafter she should teach but one new word per day.

"Hers not to make reply,
Hers not to reason why,
Hers but to do and cry!"

After that she got out the glossy manual which the superintendent had compiled all by his lone self, and she read: "Grade A must finish the First Reader in one year." Now there were 176 days in that school year, and there were 417 different words in the reader. One word a day! How could she manage it?

Happily, the "one-a-day" plan was soon displaced by a scheme of grander proportions. This time he came heralded by a rattling, rumbling sound that brought the pupils up standing. Upon his face a great radiance shone; from his neck a tape line dangled; in his left hand swung a pair of prodigious calipers; with his right he trundled a platform scale loaded with apparatus for eye tests and ear tests, with height gauges, ergometers, thermometers, spirometers, etc. The regular recitations were suspended while the instruments were exhibited and explained, and a few of the braver children measured and tested. The teacher was furnished with a new basis of classification and promotion, in which the physical record played an important rôle. She was ordered not to admit to the school in future pupils who should fall below certain standards of weight and measure.

No attack should be made upon *judicious* experiments. Without them teaching would be but a synonym for groove-running. But there is abundant reason for objecting most emphatically: (1) To a superintendent's utter lack of discrimination between good theories and bad ones; (2) to his hap-hazard way of springing experiments upon a school without consulting the teacher; and (3) to the rapidity with which he crowds theories upon a teacher, without allowing her time to weave even the worthy ones into her own originating force.

In this world of extremes, the *experimenter* is usually followed by the *fossil*, who calls himself a conservative. If he has fallen into this antiquated state from lack of energy or from lack of ability, he amounts to

nothing as a working force. Under such direction, or lack of direction, rather, the timid teacher gives weak, ineffectual service, while the over-confident teacher rushes ahead, carrying out such plans as seem good for her particular department, but she does it in total ignorance as to whether these plans will find logical sequence in the higher grades.

Then there is the *fossil from choice*, the worst conservative on the terrestrial ball. Oppose him, and he is a tyrant; obey him, and you are a fossil yourself. The kindergarten, which the experimenter fitted up so elaborately, this fossil passes over with grim and silent forbearance. In his cold and glassy eye the teacher reads that she, of all others, may not dwell long in the land of the conservative. And, under the combined blight of her too-evident sadness and his disapproval, the little people endure more than tiny tongues can tell.

But in no department does he set his hand and seal so firmly as in the primary. There the way of the teacher becomes invariably hard, while the way of the learner becomes infinitely harder, because it is infinitely more abstract. The typewriters and printing-presses he conveys to the high-school laboratory — for experimental purposes. The sand and clay in stock he suffers them to use, for the sole reason that he wastes nothing, not even dirt. Every pupil — down to Tommy in his sack apron — must have a Universal Speller. He revives the toe-mark. With his own hand he paints that dismal line of bluish-brown. He forces beginners to print three months even if they could write when they entered school. He longs for the slates his grandfather smeared, and sighs for the gourds that hung by the well.

The hinderers all live in the same block — the stumbling block — so it is only a step over to the *mechanical superintendent*. He is known by the supply catalogues, library schemes, sample diplomas, registers, elaborate reports, blackboards, erasers, coal-hods, brooms, and fiery furnaces, out of which he has constructed about himself a wondrous wall, which no primary minister or infantile legation has ever been able to penetrate or scale, and come in contact with his professional personality.

He visits the primary department periodically, standing in full view of the school while his eye travels critically over the windows in search of faulty ventilation or bad lighting, across blackboards that should be clean and glossy as a raven's wing, into corners for webs, and beyond the shadows for he-knows-not-what. He looks at the thermometer, rattles the register, and takes an inventory of the cabinet. Then he bends double and peeps down each aisle to see if the children's feet touch the floor squarely. The pantomime is so interesting that all recitations have

long since been abandoned. He rounds up at the teacher's desk, secures her record, and tramps out. The mechanical details are all right. Miss Blank is a good teacher.

No fault can be found with his material conditions for instruction. In the realm of matter he is indeed a genius; but when he undertakes to apply the same principles to an elusive, spiritual thing like the mind, he is unique. His course of study cannot be matched in logical arrangement of subject-matter, nor can it be equalled in ignorance of the natural development of a human soul. He has a neat, precise method for each individual study, which the teacher must use to the exclusion of all other methods. This, together with the course of study, is a bit hard on the pupils; but, like Squeers's treacle and brimstone, "it's good for 'em."

His catalogue, too, is clean-cut and original. Indeed, it would have done credit to a Miles Standish or a King Cyrus. According to its mandates, no child is permitted to enter the building before the ringing of the first bell — though the tempest rage and the thermometer sulk at 20° below zero. The eager little feet must learn a lesson. Let them stand in the snow until the janitor hangs up the rope and shuffles to the door. The teacher will wipe away their frozen tears and thaw out their little toes; and if they happen to take a chill, she will send them home. Where there is a will there is a way!

And there is that matter of excuses, too. When a pupil is absent, the teacher must send the parent a written notice of such absence twice a day, until an excuse is received or the child returned. Sometimes the cause is death. The teacher knows it, the superintendent knows it, the whole town knows it; only the catalogue is ignorant. Twice a day must those notices be sent, until the afflicted parents get time and heart to write the excuse exacted. Often they are hurt or indignant, but what does that signify? The dignity of the law has been sustained: the catalogue has not been trailed in the dust.

And yet, after all, one feels some qualms of conscience when one attacks the mechanical superintendent; for usually he is a man of marked industry and serious motive. And besides, there may be mitigating circumstances. There are school boards, for instance, whose duties end as soon as they put in all their available relatives as teachers and employ a veteran of three wars as janitor. The superintendent must do the rest; that is what they hired him for. Such a man is a martyr, deserving of our tears and sympathy; for no one, we believe, should be held responsible beyond the limits of the opportunities given him.

And there are so many other things which the *hindering superin-*

tendents do, which, if they should be recorded, every one, would make up a good-sized library. The trouble with all of them is that they do not know, or else have failed to grasp, the real purpose of school organization. The character of their work reveals this. A man's conception of the real issue is bound to shape and color his every act of supervision. If to his mind the school exists primarily for the benefit of teachers and school officers, he will be constantly striving toward lessening his own labor, raising his salary, or making a reputation for himself; the improvements accruing to the school, if any, being only the means to his selfish ends. On the other hand, however, he may have a vague notion that, somehow or other, the whole thing is for the children. So he attaches himself to some psychological sect and proceeds to study "the child," the abstract child, whose mind he can divide into convenient little chunks, wrap in bits of blue stocking, label, and pigeon-hole — the neatest, deadeast thing in pedagogics.

Among them all these superintendents have studied everything in the organization except those for whom it was created, the children — these actual entities, these real beings, that wriggle and sniff and ask questions, that demand a piece of one's heart, and hand over the whole of theirs in return. Sometimes one is moved to suspicion that the trouble is back even of their misconception of the school purpose; that it is a lack of personal interest and affinity for children themselves; that if it were not for the jingling compensations they would not be stretching out their arms and bidding little children to come unto them. Yet all of these superintendents are called. The pity of it is that any are chosen.

Now, as to ways that help. Under ideal conditions, the superintendent is free to devote his time and energies almost exclusively to the supervision of teachers, the business or mechanical phase being given to a separate supervisor or director. But since these ideal conditions are seldom found, it seems best to consider the superior officer, as most of us know him, in the double rôle of business agent and pedagogical expert. He is chosen, "the fairest of ten thousand, and the one altogether lovely"; at least his recommendations so picture him, as do the recommendations of every other applicant. But the members of the board brush these aside and look at the man; and by reason of his personality they grant him the place.

Everything is new to him, everything but the universal principle of common sense, and he goes to work. The board does not seek him sorrowing, lest he fail to attend the election of teachers. He is there. He even pushes his prerogative so far as to secure the election of every ca-

pable teacher who has applied; and in the chorus arising from their grateful hearts is heard one clear note of purest joy. It comes from the primary teacher, who rejoices not so much because her name is again written there, but rather that her labor has not been in vain, that her little pupils will pass into hands as appreciative and skilful as her own.

But this is not all. The superintendent carefully surveys the field of his environment. Then he adjusts his best educational conceptions to the existing conditions, and reorganizes the system. One year will not suffice to carry out his plans; two years will scarcely see them well started. Clearly, then, he owes it to the schools to retain his position and that of every faithful teacher in the corps.

How reassuring and inspiring is the work with a leader who has a definite, increasing purpose, and the stamina to carry it out! That a superintendent is helpful does not argue that he is perfect. He is not; and the hopeful part of it is that he recognizes his imperfection. Freed from the bias of hobbyism, experimentalism, fossilism, and other self-blindingisms, the helpful superintendent turns his eye upon himself first and discovers his own limitations; and, having discovered them, he straightway sets to work to extend his lines, thoughtfully, persistently, and, above all, gradually.

Then, without rousing suspicion, he begins to look for the limitations of his assistants, not in the vague abstractions found in "Handy Guides for Superintendents," but in the "actual entities," the "real beings," themselves. He studies his primary teacher much as he would study a rare flower or a troublesome weed, as the case might be. Possibly she does not see the relation which her work sustains to the rest of the course. A serious case of blindness surely; and it takes skilful manipulation of common clay to restore, or rather induce, professional sight; but the helpful superintendent tries it, and is often successful.

Or it may be that her organization is faulty. Here again the strong hands sustain the weak, not once, but in all subsequent readjustments, or at least until she develops sufficient power under his direction to organize without assistance. It is even possible that she may excel in all else and fail in government, not so much from lack of muscle as from lack of judgment. The superintendent can give temporary relief by terrorizing the school; but he usually employs a more enduring method, that of helping the teacher to find the rational punishment for individual offenders. Indeed, as an interpreter of boy nature the superintendent is, by divine right, an expert. The proverbially bad boy is no enigma to him.

But helping a teacher to transcend her own limitations sometimes calls for heroic treatment. One schoolma'am has camped so many years in a pedagogical desert that she has fashioned a calf of ancient methods and prehistoric theories. Another brings a bespangled animal carved of yesterday's fads and to-day's follies. And they fall to worshipping. The chivalric superintendent would wean them from their calves; but the helpful superintendent falls upon their idols and burns them with his wrath, grinds them in the mill of his vengeance, and scatters their dust to the four winds. In their stead he enthrones a little child.

There are other teachers with faces invariably drawn and pale and with nerves unstrung. They are miserable, and so are their schools. The helpful superintendent waits a reasonable time for them to retire, and then he proffers his official suggestions.

The one who shines like a star in the social firmament every night, and goes into a total eclipse every day in the school-room, is advised to turn her light upon her children sitting in darkness, and to give society — already surfeited with nocturnal splendors — the benefit of a prolonged eclipse.

As for the woman who stars in the religious firmament as conductor of cottage prayer-meetings, chairman of foreign missionary societies, walking delegate of the district W. C. T. U., manager-in-chief of church festivals, and generalissimo of every other supposedly moral movement, the superintendent walks straight up to her, undaunted by sentimental considerations, reminds her that school teaching is no less a work for the Master because it is paid for, and that the Lord could think but ill of a professed follower who holds the little ones at arm's length, and oppresses them with her cheerless tones and jaded spirits.

A pleasanter task than this, though fully as useful, is relieving teachers of as much nervous strain as possible. It does give a woman such a cosey sense of security to know that the man in charge is just, and sincerely sympathetic; that he will stand between her and all inflammable patrons; that he will cause the book-agent to flee away; that he will defend her interests in the presence of an august and all-powerful board; that he is, in brief, her fortress and her high tower. He does not presume to meddle with the details of primary work, except in flagrant cases of incompetency, but allows his teachers that fulness of liberty which, more than all else, fosters the development of artistic teaching.

It sometimes happens that a school board is disinclined or financially unable to furnish that abundance of supplies required for strong primary work. Our superintendent lays hold of the new limitation and

begins a characteristic investigation; but he finds the limitation is, after all, neither new nor rare — that probably half the primary teachers of our great commonwealth are expected to do highly concrete work with one home-made paddle and a box of crayon, with instructions to use the latter economically. But what surprises him still more is the fact that as the pupil passes on up through the grades with ever increasing power for abstract thinking, he is supplied more and more with expensive material for concrete thinking. And when he gets into the college or university, where the mature student thinks best with both eyes shut, he finds chemical and physical laboratories costing thousands of dollars, and uniformed assistants to make the wheels go round. This stupendous partiality for the higher institutions is distressingly clear to all thoughtful superintendents; and to them primary teachers must look for that ultimate adjustment which shall place the more abundant supply where nature indicates the greater need.

While much of a superintendent's helpfulness is accomplished through the exercise of authority or by direct suggestion, as already indicated, the greater good comes from his higher service, that constant rational guidance through the educational processes, and, more especially, that persistent stimulus to broader culture and loftier heights in the professional life. Like Goldsmith's village preacher,

"He tries each art, reproves each dull delay,
Allures to brighter worlds, and leads the way."

ALICE IRWIN THOMPSON.

"TABLOID JOURNALISM": ITS CAUSES AND EFFECTS.

RECENTLY, we have been treated to an experiment in daily journalism. Mr. Alfred Harmsworth has given us his idea of what the twentieth century newspaper should be. He calls it "tabloid journalism." Like everything new, it has been talked about, condemned, and approved.

This is an age of tabloids, which is only another name for concentration. We take our medicines in the form of pills and capsules and tabloids; we take our nourishment in the form of an ox boiled down to a tea cup; even our intellectual *pabulum* must come in a similar form. It is all characteristic of the rush, hurry, superficiality, and the desire to avoid trouble, which were the distinguishing traits of the century just closed. If a man is sick he takes his capsule because he can absorb it anywhere; it does not cause him to lose even a minute from his business; it is so delightfully simple; and so, in the same way, he can snatch a meal out of a spoonful of beef tea. He can also read the history of the world in one sitting in Somebody's "The Universe at a Glance in Pointed Paragraphs."

Mr. Alfred Harmsworth is a genius. He possesses the three great gifts which make for success wherever they may be employed. He has tremendous vitality; he has the power intuitively to divine what the world wants, and he has the ability to execute. Such a man would make his mark in any line of endeavor. He would be as successful in finance or statesmanship or war as he has been in journalism; and what he has accomplished in journalism the world knows.

A man of unusually keen perceptions and with the audacity which is spelled genius when it wins, Mr. Harmsworth saw in London a mine so rich and so easily to be worked that its golden possibilities were staggering. Education in England had succeeded admirably in turning out every year an ever-increasing host of half-baked sciolists of both sexes. The board schools, the Acts of Parliament, and the ever-zealous educational officers had enabled them to get hold of a smattering; and with the "Three Rs" they acquired something which had not been provided for by Parliament or boards of education. Crude, immature, raw, and un-

able to assimilate the little knowledge which had been tabloidly furnished to them, the result of education, in nine cases out of ten, was to give them a vague longing for something which they could not define or express. It had given them aspiration for what they knew not; it had stirred passions and aroused desires which had shadowed across their minds, but never assumed substance. The "work'us kid," whose past was a grim recollection of starvation and torture, and whose anticipation of the future was equally joyless, gave way to the "board school boy," who quickly forgot his multiplication table and his grammar, but who never forgot that not everybody worked. In a word, he wanted to be amused.

Here was a constituency ready made. Mr. Harmsworth gave the world — his world of London, a city, remember, with a population greater than that of any State of the American Union, with three exceptions — "Answers." It was exactly what had been demanded; it was the answer to the unexpressed desire. It was neither vicious nor virtuous; it did not elevate, neither did it demoralize; it was not witty or enlightening; it was simply commonplace, dull, trivial, and exactly suited to the mental requirements of its readers. And that, after all, was the secret of nineteenth century commercial success — to give the people — precisely what they wanted. Errand boys and factory hands invested their coppers in "Answers." They read it at their lunch, and it was the Attic salt to their hunk of dry bread and rancid bacon. The errand boy took a tabloid, one of Mr. Harmsworth's paragraphs, as he went loitering between the bank and Lombard street; the young clerk in the interval between measuring half a yard of ribbon, furtively snatched a tabloid under the counter when the floorwalker's back was turned. Mr. Harmsworth was the P. T. Barnum of England. He furnished a "refined entertainment." He gave his readers amusement; he provided them with "jokes." Some of his tabloids were so deftly sugar-coated that "the useful information" which they contained could be taken by even the most sensitive stomachs.

One of the phenomena of the nineteenth century — one wonders if the same thing will continue during the present — was the fecundity created by a demand. When a demand existed and an attempt was made to satisfy it, instead of the public being satiated, a new appetite was born. In nothing has this been so marked as in cheap literature, including in the term newspapers and magazines as well as books. The circulation of newspapers and magazines has enormously increased since their reduction in price. One "Answers" could not supply the ever-increasing demand. Mr. Harmsworth's rivals, who were without his creative force,

but intelligent enough to follow where he led, saw their opportunity and threw into the insatiable maw "Answers" under other names.

Nor did Mr. Harmsworth propose to suffer the fate of most pioneers and, after having cleared the ground, see others garner the crops. He duplicated and reduplicated his original production, the prototype of the whole family, until to-day the news stands of London are covered with "Answers," "Tit-Bits," "Smith's Scraps," "Jones' Sayings," "Brown's Hash," and so on through a couple of score more until one wonders who reads them and how they manage to exist. But the question who reads them is quickly answered. Go into any bus or train or lunch room at any hour of the day or night and you see men and boys and women and girls taking and enjoying their tabloids.

The curious thing is that the reading is no longer confined to the class for whom it was originally intended, as the people of greater intelligence are not ashamed to acknowledge that they are addicted to tabloidism. Last summer, while going from London to Glasgow, I fell in with a middle-aged Englishman, whom I later learned was the executive of a large corporation. He had a bundle of papers and magazines, among them half a dozen brands of tabloids. We engaged in conversation, and he courteously handed me a tabloid. When I expressed a preference for nutriment in another form, he explained that he found in tabloids a mental diversion. "I get tired of 'The Saturday Review' and 'The Spectator,'" he said, "and I read these things because they keep me from thinking."

They are all the same. They are all stamped from one die. Mr. Harmsworth knows his readers better than they know themselves. He knows that they are incapable of sustained thought, and that with them language is direct. Consequently, you must talk to them in as few words as possible; you must hold their attention in a sentence and not in a paragraph. In a story they want situations, not incidents. Occasionally, the proprietor originates a prize—a life insurance policy, a catch-penny scheme of some kind—and immediately his rivals take it for their own. Having assimilated one tabloid you have taken all; and, like the modern patent medicine, these tabloids have a variety of uses—from wrapping up the errand boy's lunch to lining the pantry shelves.

From the weekly "Answers" to the "Daily Mail" is a short step. Until the advent of Mr. Harmsworth into daily journalism, the London newspapers were the dullest, the heaviest, the most unattractive, and the least intelligent press in the world. This last assertion, I suppose, will be questioned. It is a fact, however, that in their gathering and

treatment of news, which includes the editorial comment upon it, the London newspapers have always displayed antiquated methods and an unintelligent grasp of events. I am quite aware of the fact that the editorial writers on the leading London papers are men of wide and thorough knowledge, and that it is popularly supposed that the important editorials are written by specialists — men who, in addition to their literary ability, have a professional and intimate knowledge of their subject; and yet, despite their knowledge and their professional attainments, the ignorance and glaring inaccuracies are astounding.

No one can know everything; and when I am given a ponderous column and a half on the latest archaeological discovery I am quite willing to accept the writer's dictum for the correctness of his conclusions; but when I glanced over a review of a session of Congress just closed, as I did in London last summer, and in a column editorial discovered by actual count fourteen misstatements of facts and confusion of men and things, I wondered what had happened to the American "specialist." The old motto, "False in one, false in all," might be justly applied. If these writers are so ignorant of America, a country which has been brought so close to them, and whose people speak their own tongue, is it not a fair presumption that their ignorance must be much greater of countries more remote, whose peoples are alien to them in language and thought?

The editorial page of a London newspaper is ponderous, and the news pages are unsatisfactory, dull, and monotonous. The English reporter or correspondent is not trained to write, but simply to record facts. The well written account of an important event — the opening of Parliament, the departure of troops, the return of a popular hero, a yacht race — which is such a marked feature of an American newspaper is unknown in England. The London editor shows his appreciation of the value of news by space. He gives to it several columns; but we find nothing but words, words, words. The descriptive, the photographic reproduction, the light and shade, the touch of wit, the playful fancy of the writer, the human interest — all this we know in the American newspaper; but one never sees it in the London reporter's "story." In fact, if I were asked to present the distinction between American and English reporting in a few words, I should say that in America we aim to give photographs, while in England they content themselves with working drawings made to exact scale.

If the people wanted tabloids once a week, was it not reasonable to suppose, Mr. Harmsworth argued, that they would swallow them every morning before breakfast? Again Mr. Harmsworth gave them just what

they wanted. There are no heavy editorials in the "Mail"; there are no long and dull articles in its news columns. It is not well written, but it is not disreputable. It has none of the spice of the devil about it. It has no shrinking modesty. If it sends a special correspondent to Timbuctoo you are apt to know it; and you will be probably told of the enormous expense, the wonderful enterprise, and the gigantic labor involved. The dispatches from Timbuctoo appear in large type, and illustrated with maps and pictures. The correspondent is lurid and so graphically exact that one wonders how he can know so much when no one else knows anything. Perhaps later you find out that he has been a trifle imaginative, but no one cares for yesterday's tabloid. Tabloids are warranted not to keep in any climate and to spoil twelve hours after manufacture. They are like yesterday's snowstorm.

All this is an old story in the United States, although it was very new in London. To a certain extent Mr. Harmsworth has revolutionized English journalism, and he has revolutionized it by applying methods which have long been in vogue on this side of the Atlantic. The "Mail" furnishes no new suggestion to an American newspaper manager.

Thus far, the causes of what Mr. Harmsworth has ingeniously called "tabloid journalism." Now, what are its effects? (As it seems to me, the effect of tabloid journalism is distinctly bad in that it destroys the taste for more serious reading.) The ordinary daily newspaper is unquestionably an educational medium; and the majority, the great majority, of editors are to be found on the side of morality and decent living and civic virtue. Yet newspaper reading is not an intellectual training, and the man who devotes much time to the newspapers finds it difficult to concentrate his thoughts on books, which are not to be assimilated at a glance. In the nature of things it must be so. No newspaper writer dares to be deep or exhibit his knowledge. That would be fatal. He must be light, even flippant, and always interesting. Nor will the reader waste much time over what does not interest him in the first few lines. If it does not hold his attention he skips to something else; and after his spirits have been depressed by reading an editorial on the state of trade in South America, he can recover his vitality by perusing the "Humorous Side of Life."

Mr. Harmsworth would make the condition even worse than this. (He would offer everything to his reader in concentrated form and would still further discourage his necessity to think. And that is the psychological explanation of tabloidism.) The editor of one of the most successful magazines of the day said recently to a writer: "Your article is

excellent and most interesting; but, unfortunately, it makes the reader think, and our aim is to amuse and not to instruct the readers of our magazine." Remembering what my English acquaintance said, it looks as if the whole world at this day were trying not to think, but simply to amuse itself.

Fortunately, the American newspaper reader has not yet reached the tabloid state. He wants his news presented as concisely as possible; he does not want long disquisitions on recondite subjects which have no possible interest for him; he cares more for news than views; but he does not care for a diet of scraps. If a story is to be told he wants it told in full; and if it is well written and has intrinsic importance, he does not find two or three columns any too much. He does not want essays served with his breakfast coffee, but he is prepared to read a not too abstruse article which may instruct him. In other words, his appetite is too healthy to be satisfied with tabloids.

A. MAURICE Low.

HOMICIDE AND THE ITALIANS.

FOR two reasons Italy has obtained an unenviable reputation in regard to crime. Not only has a very careful study of crime among the Italians been made by criminologists, but it so happens that crime in that country has been frequently accompanied by extraordinary circumstances. It has thus come to pass that many persons have formed the impression that our beautiful country is privileged ground for the production of criminals. For example, after the assassination of King Humbert, the newspapers and letters which I received from the United States contained, directly or indirectly, the most severe as well as the most unjust estimates of the character of the Italian people.

A young lady of Indiana, who has been in Italy, and who is incapable of descending to mere vulgar prejudices, wrote thus to a friend of mine:

"The assassination of King Humbert has called forth many bitter and scathing remarks upon the Italian in general. It has been said that almost all anarchists are of that nationality; that Italians are a murderous race, who, when they become angry, would as soon kill a person as look at him; that they are all alike in that respect; etc., etc. You have no idea of what things have been said."

All this is, indeed, most lamentable, and reminds one of the lady who once asked if all Italians were "fruit-store men"!

Taken all in all, it is true that the knife and the revolver have gained for the Italians an unenviable notoriety. The history of the temporary emigration of Italians to Switzerland, France, and Germany, and of their permanent emigration to the other side of the Atlantic, particularly to the United States, is rife with disagreeable facts; and, unfortunately, newspaper writers, with their customary exaggerations, have managed to render such facts glaringly revolting. Now, in these days, when so many Italians have become American citizens, and are participating in the political events of that country, I think it may not be uninteresting to the readers of THE FORUM to have placed before them a true and impartial account concerning homicide among Italians. A search after the truth is always useful.

Moreover, the prejudice against Italians does not exist in the United States alone. Even in Italy unfavorable criticism concerning the char-

acter of the Italian has been supported by certain statistics, poorly collected, however, and still more poorly interpreted. I refer to the statistics reported by Lombroso's school of criminology. Indeed, the most eminent man of this school has accredited the Italians with ferity as their principal characteristic!

Every Italian who holds himself aloof from the prejudices of ordinary patriotism will recognize that the moral conditions of our country are not of the best, and that in the general statistics of homicide Italy holds a disgraceful supremacy. More murders are committed in Italy than in Spain or Hungary; and in the latter two countries the number of homicides has been supposed to be the largest in Europe. Having said this much, with a sincerity which none can doubt, it remains for us to examine into the details concerning the fact.

For the years 1895-96-97, we find that an average of 12.58 per 100,000 inhabitants in Italy have been accused of homicide. A more detailed study brings to light these facts: (1) The provinces of Italy which give the highest averages for homicide are Girgenti, 52.65; Sassari, 36.53; Trapani, 33.25; Palermo, 32.25; and Naples, 31.76. (2) Those which yield the lowest averages are Mantua, 1.87; Bergamo, 2.12; Padua, 2.15; Sondrio, 2.47; and Cremona, 2.65. These figures go to prove that there exists in Italy a large zone — almost all northern Italy — which, as regards homicide, very nearly approaches the most civilized countries of Europe. Difficult as is the study of crime in the United States, it may be said that there exists in that country also an enormous difference in the criminal statistics of different regions. For example, in the statistics for 1898 we find a maximum of 20 homicides per 100,000 inhabitants in New York. In San Francisco the number was 13.33. The minimum was found in Baltimore, 0.59. Washington has the small percentage of 0.73. Italy and the United States are pre-eminent in regard to the differences in social conditions found in the different sections of the same country.

And here I must call attention to another point. The various political crimes of the Italians have given the enemies of democracy the pretext of attributing the high criminal average to the propaganda through which the popular factions — republicans, radicals, and socialists — are seeking to spur the Italian people on to a more highly civilized life. Now, statistics show that the crime of homicide is greatest in the south of Italy — in Sardinia and Sicily — that is to say, in those parts where the fewest republicans and socialists are to be found; where, in fact, they do not exist as a political party. If we look upon homicide from the

standpoint of political propagandism, we are forced to admit that in Italy, as in Germany, such propaganda exerts a moderating influence over crime. In the north of Italy, where, as we have seen, the crime of homicide is at a minimum, radicals, republicans, and socialists abound, and are organized into strong political factions.

But let us leave for the moment this argument concerning political revolutionary propaganda. I have said that northern Italy is in a state of moral superiority, as compared to southern Italy, from the standpoint of statistics of homicide. But he is mistaken who believes that this superiority has always existed. At a period not very long past, *i.e.*, at the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, Lombardy, Piedmont, and Venice — which to-day are objects of universal envy and admiration — were morally in a very inferior condition. The Piedmontese, Lombards, and Venetians of that time strongly resembled the Sardinians and Sicilians of the present day. This proves that crime is not a question of race, as some pseudo-scientists, who love to cling to the old formulæ and thus profoundly impress the ignorant, would have us believe.

And if the history of the past disposes of the opinion that crime among Italians is a mere question of race, so does the history of the present encourage us to hope for the gradual moral regeneration of all the regions of southern Italy, now so stained with the crime of murder. This hope is not merely founded on ardent desire, but is based on actual statistics. To prove this, we need simply to compare the statistics of 1879–83 with those of 1895–97; for this comparison shows very clearly that homicide is diminishing appreciably throughout all Italy, and that the average has dropped from 17.88 per 100,000 inhabitants, to 12.58. The diminution has been considerable in some provinces of central Italy. In Ancona it has fallen from 19.83 to 8.86; in Pesaro, from 18.02 to 7.29; in Leghorn, from 21.38 to 5.53. This diminution is also generally noticeable in the provinces of the south. One province alone in all Italy is a melancholy exception to the rule — Naples. Here homicide statistics show an increase from 26.71 to 31.76. And yet this is not to be wondered at, when we consider the social conditions of that city.

Noteworthy also is the fact that the diminution of homicide in Italy has been neither accidental nor irregular. It has, indeed, been both regular and continuous. From 5,418 homicides in 1880, the number fell to 3,868 in 1896. And this reduction of some 30 per cent in the general average of the country was brought about without any direct influence of education, with which the Italian Government does not greatly

concern itself. It has been determined by other social factors, which have indirectly spread their advantageous influences — roads, the telegraph, newspapers, commerce, facility of access to the most refined and cultivated centres, and, above all, emigration.

Emigration has been of assistance in a number of ways: (1) Because emigration is generally undertaken by men, and, for the most part, youths, who yield the largest proportion of homicides. (2) Those who depart help to improve the condition of those who remain, either by means of an increase in earnings on the part of the latter, or by the savings which the emigrants send home from abroad. In fact, the amount sent home to Italy by emigrants reaches a total of about 300,-000,000 lire per annum. (3) Education has been of assistance; for, when emigrants return from cultured surroundings, such as Switzerland, France, and the United States afford, they exert a helpful influence on their relatives and friends at home.

And now let us ask: If in less than twenty years, without any organized effort to decrease the number of homicides, we have obtained such satisfactory results, what wonders might not come to pass if the State and the ruling classes should endeavor, directly and persistently, to combat this crime? If they should do this, Italy would be no longer pointed out to the world as the nation of crime.

The study of the causes which bring about crime is one of very great interest, and is now being prosecuted with the utmost diligence in Italy, where the criminal phenomenon is most intensely manifest. Our form of government encourages this condition; the want of general education encourages it; and, above all, the want of culture encourages it. Where education is lacking, there is wanting also the development of the soul, without which no check is placed upon the human passions. On the other hand, in places where education has advanced, it has had the effect of moderating the criminal tendency. Where we find the combination of oppression and ignorance, as has been the case for a long time in southern Italy, there the manifestations of crime are greatest. In the south of Italy, in Latium, Romagna, and Sicily, criminal associations sometimes assumed a political aspect.

I shall not dwell here on the reports bearing upon the relation of the various systems of government to crimes of violence; I shall turn, instead, to those reports referring to homicide and education. The reader must bear in mind, meanwhile, that instruction and education are intimately connected with political and economic conditions. Hence, while speaking of homicide and lack of education, I shall keep in mind the

system of government as determining the foundation and breadth of education.

The intimate relation between homicide and the want of education may be found in every case, and Italy serves admirably for such demonstration. Considering the invaluable statistics of Dr. Bosco — one of the most noteworthy among the students of the conditions in the United States — we find that, with the exception of certain small oscillations in some of the provinces of Italy, the maximum of homicide coincides with that of the want of education. In Sardinia and in Sicily — in the period 1879–83 — the greatest number of homicides coincided with this lack of education. On the other hand, the smallest number of homicides is to be found in Lombardy and Piedmont and in some parts of Emilia, where the lack of education is least in evidence.

International comparisons confirm this report. Dr. Bosco, in his excellent study of homicide in the United States, has demonstrated that the same condition is true of the other side of the Atlantic as well. He has found that extensive culture helps to decrease violent crime by modifying the habits of the people, rendering them more mild in disposition.

Further data on the relation between education and homicide are furnished by another important publication, one belonging to the General Bureau of Statistics of Rome, published in 1899, regarding the vocation of those guilty of homicide. While those who followed "roving" trades gave the enormous total of 4,738 convicted out of 100,000 individuals, we find that artisans, clerks, teachers, capitalists, and householders yielded not more than 288 convicted out of 100,000. In the face of this, who can deny the influence of social conditions upon the genesis of crime?

The highest contingent of homicides comes from laborers and miners, who, as is well known, live a life of peril, poverty, and ignorance. The high total which marks the homicides in Gирgenti and Caltanissetta may be traced to the poor, brutalized miners of Sicily, where mining life is most prevalent, and where education among the miners is *nil*.

In my opinion, Italy, of all countries, is the best suited for demonstrating the parallelism of homicide and ignorance. But examples are not wanting in other countries. In England the spread of education has greatly diminished the number of homicides. And yet, in two well-known works, Mr. Merridon argued that it was unnecessary to educate criminals, that education was only an incentive to crime. In Switzerland education has almost eliminated homicide. What has occurred in the Ticino canton is eloquent proof of this. Sixty years ago, in that can-

ton, as in Italy, homicides were frequent, and ignorance abounded. To-day, we find that district — which by the map is Italian, as it is by race, language, and religion — morally and intellectually on a level with the rest of Switzerland and the other cultured countries of Europe. The few homicides which do occur in the Ticino canton are, sad to relate, to a great extent committed by the Italian immigrants, who perpetrate there the crimes resulting from their poverty and ignorance.

Having thus briefly discussed the conditions, let us now direct our attention to the lessons to be learned from them. These lessons, as regards Italy, are very clear: (1) Homicide in Italy is not a question of race; (2) the manifestation of homicide is shown by statistics to vary with the social conditions; and (3) first among the social factors of homicide is lack of education.

Now, it can be very well maintained that education in itself is directly influential in diminishing capital crimes, for the reason that it checks impulsiveness and develops the moral qualities. The Italian Government falls disgracefully short in its duty as regards public education. The law of 1877, which obliges all children to attend school as far as the third elementary class, is an ironical one, as no provision was made by the State to ensure that it would be carried into effect. Poverty prevents the people from sending their children to school. Indeed, poverty obliges these children to work.

Again, the annual expenditure for public education by the Italian Government is ridiculously small. In this respect, it is far behind the other civilized countries, as the following figures will indicate:

| Country. | Year. | Population. | Expenditure in Lire. |
|---------------------|-------|-------------|----------------------|
| Great Britain | 1890 | 39,694,542 | 315,410,090 |
| France | 1890 | 38,517,975 | 185,240,060 |
| Russia | 1895 | 31,849,795 | 189,830,335 |
| Italy | 1890 | 31,290,490 | 60,821,220 |

The United States expends about 1,000,000,000 lire annually for educational purposes. And to Italy's greater disgrace, we must remember that Switzerland, with one-tenth of Italy's population, expends two-thirds more for education.

In Italy, the government is merely the instrument of the wealthy ruling classes, and the constitution is a living falsehood. With a population of 30,000,000 there are not many more than 1,000,000 electors. In the eyes of the Italian governing classes, whom the American tour-

ists call "the best society in Italy," the populace exists merely as a mechanism for work. For the ruling classes of Italy all the marvellous examples of educational institutions, which the English and Americans have spread over the world, have no value. And, as long as the majority of the Italian people deplore their own delinquencies, it is clear that the responsibility for the very unfavorable conditions under which the masses in Italy are forced to live rests upon the shoulders of the ruling classes.

NAPOLEONE COLAJANNI.

THE HOPES AND FEARS OF RUSSIA.

DURING the last five years, the hopes and fears of the Russian nation have undergone an evolution which is of no small interest to students of sociology, and which may well cheer the hearts of all believers in democracy. Centred at the outset in the person of the autocrat, they have been gradually transferred to the self-respect, self-confidence, and stubborn activity of the thinking portion of the nation. The process was painful, yet salutary.

There is in the Russian folk-lore a very poetical figure which occurs in many legends, that of a warrior and hero who comes to a crossing where he finds an ancient stone bearing the inscription of the words of fate:

"Whosoever goes left will meet with death, though his charger will be spared ; whosoever goes right will survive, though his charger will perish ; whosoever goes straight will meet with the destruction of himself as well as his charger."

In 1894, at the time when the present Tzar's father breathed his last in the Crimea, and Nicholas II took his place on the throne of the Russian Empire, the Russian people found themselves in the position of the warrior of the legend. Just as that hero, because of his grandeur, could not decline to go ahead when meeting with threatening danger, so a powerful nation could not stop its progress on approaching an unknown field. Notwithstanding the fact that it had no such clear statement of what awaited it as had the legendary hero, it had to choose a way ; and, with the instinct of a great nation, it took the path to the right. The charger of its hopes was slain, in the course of time, through the personal assistance of the Tzar ; but the Russian people found themselves on the proper route.

The circumstances which attended the accession of Nicholas II to the throne were particularly favorable to his winning the hearts of his people. The personality of the Young Man of All the Russias was to every Russian a mere blank, and it was open to the imagination to paint it in colors as bright as one's longings and hopes for the best would suggest. And these longings were ardent in 1894.

It was the end of the reign of Alexander III — the reign of which the Tzar himself was the best personification. With his enormous, clumsy figure, his bovine gaze, and a hand that could break a horseshoe or bend in two a silver coin between its fingers, with a strong dislike to books, to riding, and to moving about generally, he was suggestive of the leaden burden of stolid reaction placed by him on the Russian nation, and kept there during the whole of his reign. The latter was in its fourteenth year when it came to an end; but, judging by the extreme weariness felt by the people, it might be supposed to have lasted half a century. This feeling is thus pathetically expressed, by a talented contemporary, in a moderate and independent pamphlet of the time:

"God Almighty! if only the schools and all those who fervently work for popular education were allowed a little time for breath. If only the flogging of the peasant were stopped. If, at least, the most brazen-faced official robbers and obsecurantists were put aside. If, at least, the population of the fringe of the Empire were not so shamefully persecuted for their religion, native language, and customs. If only the monopoly of the press, in the hands of mercenary, reptile proprietors and editors, were put an end to. . . ."

Such was the pathetic wail uttered by the intelligent and honest portion of the nation at the end of Alexander III's reign; and it was not limited to the educated classes. The masses felt the same. While the present Tzar's grandfather, during whose reign the emancipation took place, has been known among the Russian peasantry as "The Peasants' Tzar," Alexander III has been nicknamed "The Landlords' Tzar," and "The Great Flogger," because under his rule flogging became quite a general practice, and an official panacea.

"The Great Flogger" was now dead, and all eyes turned immediately with hope to his successor. The new Tzar was young; he was only twenty-six years of age; and every one wished to believe that because of his youth his heart was open to generosity and to confidence in his people. All wished to think that he had not yet had time to get hardened in the egotism of his position, or demoralized by the pettiness of his surroundings, but that he would be able to rise above the narrow and selfish interests of officialdom, and to understand the feelings and position of the nation.

So the nation, on its part, showed a most loving and touching attention to the young man. As soon as the news of his father's death spread, there was a sigh of relief throughout the country. But that sigh was heaved in silence and in private lest the filial feelings of Nicholas II be offended. Outwardly the greatest reverence was shown to the memory

of the deceased, and the progress of his body from the Crimea to Moscow was one long pageant. Some towns became absolutely ruined by the enormous expense imposed on them on this occasion; yet they were silent for the moment. Characteristic of the Russian, the masses knelt on the way with the spirit of reverence to the dead, and the most humane readiness to forgive one who was about to appear before the Judge of Judges.

Every one knows that there is no Parliament in Russia. The only organized and officially acknowledged bodies representing the population are the Zemstvos, corresponding to a certain extent to your county councils. Very naturally they felt that they had to speak for the public; so they began to present the Tzar with written addresses, in which — side by side with manifestations of loyalty and expressions of grief at the sorrow that befell their new sovereign — they asked him, in most respectful language, for one favor, namely, to be admitted into his confidence, to be allowed to be heard by him direct, without the intermediary of officialdom. Such was the meaning of the addresses presented to Nicholas II by the local assemblies of the provinces of Tver, Toula, Oufa, Kourske, Voronezh, and others. They were couched in almost timid language. The most outspoken passage may be found in the Tver address, which ran thus:

"We believe that our happiness will grow and be strengthened by equal regard being paid to the law by the people and the representatives of the power of the State; because law in Russia, representing the will of the monarch, must be placed above the chance opinions of this or that delegate of the power. We firmly believe that the rights of individuals as well as of social institutions will be unflinchingly protected. We expect, Sire, that our social institutions will have the right and opportunity of expressing their opinions on questions which concern them, so that the expression of the wants and thoughts not only of the representatives of the administration, but also of the Russian people, may reach the height of the throne. We expect, Sire, that in your reign the vital social forces of Russia will move forward along the path of peace and truth. We believe that, in unity with the representatives of all classes of the Russian people, who are equally loyal to throne and fatherland, the power of your Majesty will find a new source of strength, and the pledge of success in the fulfilment of your magnanimous plans."

Was there anything in these words that could offend the feelings of any sovereign, unless he bore a baby's head on his shoulders, or looked upon his people as a herd of cattle to whom the right of expressing any wish was to be denied?

On January 17, 1895, congratulations on the occasion of the Tzar's accession to the throne and of his marriage were to be presented at the Winter Palace, by 600 deputations, representing the different municipalities, the army, various corporations, and the Zemstvos. As soon as

Nicholas II appeared in the hall, he stepped forward and delivered the following speech :

“I rejoice to see gathered here representatives of all the estates of the realm, who have come to give expression to their sentiments of loyal allegiance. I believe in the sincerity of these feelings, which have been those of every Russian from time immemorial. But it has come to my knowledge that latterly, in some meetings of the Zemstvos, voices have been heard from certain people who have allowed themselves to be carried away by absurd fancies about the participation of representatives of the Zemstvos in the general administration of the internal affairs of the State. Let all know that I devote all my strength to the good of my people, but that I shall uphold the principle of autocracy as firmly and unflinchingly as did my ever-lamented father.”

This step on the part of the Tzar was of the greatest moment. He showed by it that he did not even so much as understand what was wanted of him. He flung into the face of the representatives of the people a rebuke for their wanting to curtail his autocratic power. As a matter of fact, no such attempt was made at that time. Quite the contrary: the nation appealed to his autocracy against the unbearable rule of bureaucracy. Through their only legal representatives they told him that they preferred the rule of his single person, with the aid of law, to the rule of that soulless, and, therefore, merciless, million-headed machine, called bureaucracy. They wanted only access to his ears and to his good-will. But so much did the young man prove to be permeated with bureaucratic conceptions of government, and so little had he in common with the governed, that without going into the matter at all he simply sided at once with the bureaucracy as against the nation.

One may easily imagine the bewilderment, the disappointment, the feeling of offence and of shame that the Tzar's action produced throughout the Empire, and even abroad. Yet people wanted to hope against hope. “He is young,” they said; “he is inexperienced; he has been misled; let us wait; the coronation will be an opportunity for him.”

The coronation came and went, but it revealed no new features in the personality of the young potentate, on whom all hopeful eyes now rested, except his childlike infatuation for everything glittering, which he has probably inherited from his mother, and his unprecedented ability to squander money. His coronation cost a sum far surpassing anything spent on such occasions by other sovereigns since the founding of the Russian Empire. A lurid shadow was thrown on all that glitter by the appalling catastrophe which occurred on the plain near Moscow, where the “popular festival” was prepared for the masses. Through the criminal neglect of the administration, a ravine in the path of the moving masses was left unprotected; and, owing to the fact that the police proved

absolutely incompetent to direct the movements of the crowd, thousands fell into the trap. The moving masses were so dense that they could not stop, but trampled on those who stumbled first, being in their turn subjected to the same doom by the next rows. Over 4,000 persons, men, women, and children, perished thus in a most atrocious way; and while horribly mutilated bodies were still lying on the plain, merry tunes were playing a hundred yards away, to make people believe that everything was all right; and the Tzar and Tzaritsa appeared in pageant dress at the Royal Pavilion.

This great calamity did not contribute to the popularity of the Tzar. No one charged him with it, nor will I — that would be an injustice. But his behavior on this occasion not only revealed in a striking way his utter weakness, but also pointed out the lack on his part of strong emotion, clear thought, and manliness. The day after the calamity, when the whole of the old capital was terror-stricken and in mourning, Nicholas II appeared at the ball given at the French Embassy. He half-heartedly uttered to the Comte de Montebello a kind of apology about the position of a sovereign being that of an actor, who must appear on the stage however heavy his heart may be. But the opinion of the Russian people was different. The crowd tore down an imperial herald from his horse, and ill-treated him; stones were thrown at the Tzar's carriage on its way to the ball; and while the latter was in progress, the people outside extinguished the lights around the building, and tore to pieces the bunting. Cries of "That's how the Tzar is mourning!" were heard in the streets; inflammatory speeches were delivered; and when the police attempted to arrest the speakers, the latter were liberated by the public. No wonder! The facts were against the Tzar's explanation of his attitude. An Austrian Grand Duke died in Vienna during the coronation festivities, and the festival arranged for that day was countermanaged. But when some 4,000 or 5,000 honest but poor Russians were sacrificed to the Moloch of autocratic pageantry, the merry-making was proceeded with!

The epilogue of the coronation was worthy of the performance. When the investigation of the calamity on the Khodyne plain revealed the disgusting incompetency of the administration, the Tzar, following the advice of the surrounding official clique, hushed up the matter. He made a show of punishing the guilty parties by dismissing from their posts some third-class officials; and he gave some money to the families of some of the victims, — thus robbing them of far larger sums they might have recovered as damages, had justice been allowed to take its usual course.

These were not the only facts which gradually effaced the halo that the nation's anxieties and hopes had created around the head of Nicholas II. Even after the repeated rude awakenings I have alluded to, people tenaciously clung to the belief that if the eyes of the Young Man of All the Russias were opened by holding the picture of truth before him, everything might yet change for the best; that if opportunities were afforded to him to depend on better people, he would break the moral yoke under which he was kept by his surroundings. But the truth was divulged to him; and although opportunities were given to him, he never thought of profiting by them. The truth about the persecution of the Stundists was told him, and a lesson in religious toleration given to him, by the delegates of the Society of Friends, Messrs W. Marsh and E. W. Brooks, who succeeded in seeing the Emperor and the young Empress in private, without the knowledge of the Imperial Torquemada, Mr. Pobyedonostsev. Nevertheless, religious persecutions went on. The truth about the position of the Russian press was explained to the Tzar in a petition and memorandum presented to him by the scientists and literary men of St. Petersburg, through General Richter, without the knowledge of any of the ministers; but Nicholas referred the whole affair to those very ministers against whom the petition was mainly directed. The official inquiry into the robberies and swindles committed by one of his ministers, and other inquiries into official scandals, threw a lurid, but searching, light on what his bureaucracy was. But this did not move the Tzar to replace the bureaucratic system by anything better. He did not even permit the infamies to be exposed to light, and the offenders punished by a court.

The latest opportunity to be just, statesmanlike, and manly was afforded him by the so-called Students' Strike. The Tzar appointed his own late minister of war, General Vannovsky, to make an inquiry into the matter. But when that independent old man reported that the entire blame for the lamentable event must be put at the door of the Home Secretary and the police, Nicholas stopped him, saying that he knew everything, and that in risking their lives the police were saving his. Then he proclaimed an imperial edict, threatening the young men, in case of a new strike, with compulsory military service, as privates — a measure which takes us back to the time of Nicholas I, the Tzar-Corporal, when the Sergeant-Major was the officially acknowledged ideal for the citizen, the army was converted into a Botany Bay institution, and the law was put under the Tzar's heel.

Foreigners are unable to follow closely the course of Russian events.

Therefore, while the real value of the Tzar's personality was gradually revealed to every one of his thinking subjects, in England a great many people still placed much hope in him. When his famous summoning of the Powers to the Hague Conference took place, Nicholas II became quite a universal favorite and hero. Not in Russia; there the people knew already what to think of him and of his proposals, and bitterly laughed in their sleeves. They knew that his real character would soon come out. The Hague Conference was not yet at an end when the world was startled by the Tzar and his government forcing on Finland an enormously increased military burden in men and money, and this by absolutely unconstitutional means, and in violation of Nicholas's own oath.

The great Abraham Lincoln once said: "You can fool all of the people some of the time; and some of the people all of the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time" — not even if the people ask to be fooled, one may add. People in Russia will still eulogize Nicholas II; they will ascribe to him all kinds of good actions; and they will continue to petition and address him, not, however, because they expect anything of him. All this will be done, because under the protection of the Tzar's name the struggle against his irresponsible rule is safer and easier. But the faith in his personality is gone irrevocably, and with it a good deal of the prestige of his position. And this is pure gain. So long as we place with some one else our hopes in the improvement of our conditions, we are not politically mature. But when we have no one to rely upon, we must rely on ourselves, and that is the beginning of political maturity.

The Russians have full right to believe in their inherent powers. When I speak now of the Russians, I mean the three big branches — the Great-Russians, the Little-Russians, or OukraInians, and the White-Russians — who, though differing in language, folk-lore, and customs, belong, nevertheless, to the same Slav race, form one state, and are building up in common a civilization of their own. The Russians came upon the historical stage as late as the ninth century. Four centuries later the invasion by innumerable Mongol hordes threatened the very existence of the race, and kept it in bondage for two centuries. Yet the Russian nation outlived the calamity, and threw off the yoke in the year 1480. Since then the Russian people have made enormous sacrifices to overtake in civilization the more fortunate nations, who had had ages for their development before we could begin; and we can point with self-respect and satisfaction to the results.

The Russian nation is, no doubt, very much behind time politically and socially; its industrial development leaves much to be desired; yet,

as concerns literature, art, music, poetry, and even science, it is inferior to none of her older sisters, not excepting the British or the German nation. True, there has been only one Shakespeare in the world, and only one Goethe; yet neither the British nor the Germans have the novel as developed in Russia, which is universally acknowledged, even by American critics, to be the greatest production of its kind. A nation which has produced poets and writers like Poushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Shevchenko, Tourguenev, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Korolenko; composers like Glinka and Tchaykovsky; sculptors like Antokolsky; painters like Vereschagin, Repin, Kramskoy, and a host of others — such a nation may safely rely on her spiritual powers and possibilities. Now take science. Lomonosov, originally a fisher-boy, later an academician, who labored a century ago, anticipated by fifty years the ideas of comparative geography, as developed later by Humboldt and Richter! The names of Lomashevsky and Ostrogradsky, in mathematics; of Botkin and Pirogov, in medical science; of Mendeléyev, in chemistry, etc., — these are universally acknowledged as stars of scientific progress.

Still more confidence, perhaps, may be inspired by an attentive, discriminating look at those masses who alone insure an historical future to a nation. The Russian peasant — poor as he is, shabby and unkempt as he generally impresses the foreigner — has found in himself the ability to colonize in some four hundred years over one-half of Europe and over one-third of Asia. Ask your engineers who are employed on Russian soil, and they will tell you, if they are just, that the Russian workman is one of the quickest to understand a new idea, to adapt himself to it, and to execute it skilfully. Go into our streets, villages, fields, sail along our mighty rivers, and from the introduction of singing into work, by men and women, from the formation of special choirs in every company of soldiers, from the exquisite singing in our churches, nay, from the very cries of hawkers in the streets, you will gather that the Russians are among the most musical people of the world. Our folk-lore is one of the richest and most poetic in the world.

Undeveloped as our social life is, it contains customs and institutions which may yet prove to be living nuclei of a more just and humane order of things than the one prevailing in older nations. Among these are (1) the communal tenure of land; (2) the democratic organization of the village community, not yet altogether crushed by bureaucracy on the one hand, and capitalism on the other; and (3) the principle practised among the peasantry, according to which a stranger admitted into the family, if he has contributed by his constant work to the acquirement of fam-

ily property, has more right to its heritage than a blood-relative who has not worked. What the Russian nation needs for the full development of its potentialities is the removal of that bad legacy of an unfortunate historical past — those fetters which keep social forces and individual enterprise in check. In other words, we need personal rights, liberty, and self-government. Are there, then, any facts to inspire us with the hope that we shall acquire these things despite the opposition of the Tzar and the whole antiquated bureaucratic machinery of the Empire? Certainly there are, and a great many.

At the end of the sixties and in the seventies, we believed that a courageous, well-organized body of revolutionists, devoted to the cause, could not only fight for, but also win, the battle of liberty. And if this were really possible without any support of the masses, the Narodnaya Volya, or People's Will, was the party to do it. For several years the whole world watched with subdued breath the duel between a mere handful of men and women, mostly very young, on the one side, and the Government of one of the mightiest empires, with enormous resources, on the other. It is no exaggeration to say that the heroism, the self-sacrifice, the devotion to the loftiest ideals, the purity of life, the unswerving skill and firmness displayed by these most gentle and noble young men and girls while engaged in a bloody struggle, have never been surpassed in history. Those who doubt it may refer to books like "Underground Russia," by Sergius Stepniak, and "Siberia and the Exile System," by George Kennan. And the revolutionists actually gained the upper hand in 1881. But that was a Pyrrhic victory. The party was exhausted, and there was no one to support it. The masses at that time did not understand it; and a large portion of the intelligent class, though sympathizing with it, was not yet ripe for action.

Times have changed since then. The economic policy of the Government, and its tariff war with Germany in particular, while fostering manufactures, with all their social concomitants, caused, a few years ago, a fall in wages, which made even the very frugal existence of a Russian factory worker impossible. This created remonstrances, then riots, and, finally, strikes. At first the latter were desultory; but very soon they gained so much in discipline, organization, and unanimity of spirit, that the great strike at St. Petersburg, in the summer of 1896, mainly in the textile trade, became possible. Twenty-nine mills, comprising 35,000 men and women, struck, and asked redress for their various grievances; while 100,000 other workingmen, mainly engineers, supported them by voluntary contributions.

The spirit in which this bloodless battle was fought was so admirable on the side of the workmen that it won the acknowledgment even of the state administration. Meetings and public speeches are prohibited in Russia; and yet 12,000 engineers were assembled at the cemetery of St. Mytrotfany, the speakers being raised in the middle of the gathering, while troops with loaded rifles were standing around, not daring to charge upon the unarmed crowd. Of course, the speakers were arrested that very night. In fact, arrests, domiciliary visits, and expulsions from the capital were progressing on a very large scale during the entire strike; but the prefect publicly admitted the grievances of the strikers. Yet, while admitting the workingmen's right of redress, the Government declined to acknowledge their right to get it by means of their own actions. It declined to do anything until the strikers returned to work; but a solemn promise was given that a law for the limitation of the working-day would be promulgated. This promise was carried out — not, however, until new pressure was brought to bear on the Government, in January, 1897, by eight factories and about 18,000 men. On June 2, 1897, the law was passed which limited the normal work-day to eleven and one-half hours, and the night work to ten hours, and made a certain number of holidays and Sundays altogether free from work.

One can hardly overestimate the enormous significance of this victory for the workingmen; and it was a victory, though both big strikes mentioned were put down by violence and starving out. The practical gains attained through this law are small, though it must be acknowledged that for a very large portion of the working population they constitute an improvement worth fighting for. But the greatest importance must be attributed to the fact that for the first time in Russia's modern history the workingmen have consciously and directly forced the Tzar's Government into an act of legislation. Those who doubt this fact should read the debates of the government commission on the new law. The representative of the Ministry of International Affairs, for example, insisted not only on shortening the working-day, but also on safeguarding the workingmen from any fall in wages, "because," he said, "otherwise new disturbances may arise." In another speech he said:

"The character of the governmental interference must be such as to make the factory workingmen regard the Government as their defender and protector, and thus come to the belief that they cannot obtain any betterment of their position by means of strikes, but that they must expect it from the hands of the Government."

The success of the two big strikes alluded to, and of many others, and the further development of the labor movement, have been to a great ex-

tent due to the active part which the independent and daring portion of Russia's educated society — mostly young socialists — have taken in it. These people — undergraduates of both sexes, young lawyers, doctors, civil and technical engineers, journalists, even some factory inspectors, and other officials — did all that work for the workingmen which the operatives were not accustomed to do. They formulated the workingmen's demands on paper; typed or printed them clandestinely, with much risk to themselves; secretly published manifestoes on general questions of interest; supplied the strikers with literature; collected money for them; sent abroad communications about the course of events; and tried to consolidate and make permanent that organization which was originally only temporarily improvised for the necessities of individual strikes.

Thus the Working-Class Emancipation Leagues of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kiev were formed. Other places followed, and the movement spread all over Russia; strike after strike following in the most distant points of the Empire. In May, 1898, several groups of permanently organized workingmen, together with socialists belonging to other classes, federated, and thus formed the Social-Democratic Labor Party of the Russian Empire. This federation does not, however, include all the forces of the Russian labor movement. There are other groups, such as those that call themselves Revolutionary Socialists, and the one represented by the periodical, "The Labor Thought." The Tzar's Government wages merciless war against this movement, but it might as well fight against rain or snow; and the Government is beginning to understand that. While sowing, with one hand, destruction and misery among the active, leading sections of socialists and workingmen, it tries to find some compromise with other sections, in order to appease the masses.

The present political order of Russia is such that every independent action — whether on a religious, social, or economic ground — inevitably assumes a political meaning, and produces a political effect, as it undermines the very principle on which the all-absorbing, all-grasping, and absolute power of the Russian Government rests. According to that principle, the citizen is not a mature personality, but a child for whom everything is determined by the Government. He has no part in imperial legislation. It is the bureaucracy, headed by the Tzar, that frames, promulgates, and enforces the laws; and he must obey. His education, his political opinions, his religion, are prescribed for him; he cannot even move about without a permit from the Government, in the form of a passport. One understands that under such circumstances sectarianism assumes a political meaning. A peasant who, contrary to law, secedes

from the established orthodox church, and declines to give up his new faith, puts the commands of his personal conscience above the commands of the Government, the Tzar included.

Every one has heard a good deal about the Stundists, the Shlapouty, the Doukhobors, and other dissenters of Evangelical type, some of them with a strong tendency toward Quakerism. These deserving people, who are the best specimens of their race, were, and still are, subjected to the most revolting persecutions. They have been beaten, imprisoned, systematically starved, inhumanly tortured, exiled, and their female relatives have been treated in a most shameful and brutal manner. Yet, notwithstanding all these facts, heroic men and women have declined point-blank to comply with the orders of the Government and the official clergy which they have considered sinful. The movement has created thousands of able and fervent apostles, who, by reason of governmental deportation, are scattered throughout the Empire. It has converted millions of unthinking, passive creatures — who were until then driven about by the officials and clergy like cattle — into discriminating beings, with a sense of self-respect and a determination to oppose wrong. Many dissenters who, until last year, had concealed their real religious doctrines, profited by the last census to state their creed openly.

Besides, the upheaval of their spirit is being manifested by increasing proselytism, for which purpose some sects, for example in the Tomsk province, train their own missionaries. They also build new chapels, and write polemic books. The movement has found its way into the higher classes of the population, as evidenced by the names of Tchertkov, Birukov, Tregoubov, Prokhanov, Pashkov, Prince Khilkov, Dr. Volkenstein, and others. It has its powerful prophet in the person of Count Tolstoy. It has established its own free press, as the activity of Mr. Tchertkov, at Purleigh (in Essex), and the periodical "Bessyeda," formerly published in Sweden, show. It commands the active sympathy of the world, as has been proved by the world's press, by the emigration of 5,000 Doukhobors, through the substantial pecuniary aid of the Society of Friends and the money forwarded from England to the suffering Stundists, etc. True, this very emigration may be regarded as a victory for the Tzar's Government, as it has contrived to drive 5,000 courageous souls, who knew how to stand by their banner, out of the country, which needs such people badly.

Popular education, in the broad sense of the term, is another channel through which the self-consciousness of the masses increases. Notwithstanding every obstacle put by the Government in the way of enlighten-

ment, it cannot stop its progress; nay, it is obliged to foster some departments of it, such as professional education, because of the requirements of the State. The greater number of the Zemstvos, of the municipal councils, and of village communities that have the means, vie with one another in establishing schools, founding free libraries, and spreading useful knowledge among the masses. Only a few days ago news was published in the Russian papers about seventy village-communities, in a region so far out of the way as the Enisseysk province, in Siberia, having petitioned the Government to start primary schools in their localities; and they made a discrimination between the lay and the ecclesiastical schools, and, quite rightly, discarded the latter. On the other hand, the Zemstvos of the Tver, Moscow, and Kharkov provinces have pushed the development of their network of schools to such a degree that in a few years they intend to introduce compulsory education.

People in private life, either individually or organized in all kinds of educational societies, are pushing energetically in the same direction. They maintain poor pupils, publish good reading matter at cheap prices, start popular theatres, lantern lectures, etc. One of these institutions alone, the Comitet Gramotnosti, has published over 1,000,000 books and pamphlets. True, this institution was forcibly closed by the Government; but its former members continue the work in other ways. The Government is successful in so far only as to manage to waste a lot of the energy of the enlighteners, but it cannot stop their progress. The army itself is a vigorous instrument of primary education, as the Government has to compete with foreign armies in having intelligent soldiers.

The press is under an unbearable yoke. But what it loses in the way of liberty is compensated for in the field of expansion. The number of provincial papers has increased tenfold compared to what it was during the most liberal period of Alexander II's reign. Consequently, a provincial Russian nowadays is far from what he used to be. He feels his connection with the rest of the world, and he has gained in initiative as well as in criticism. Moreover, the provincial press, profiting by the stupidity of the local censors, sometimes brings to light facts of the greatest importance, which would never come out through the metropolitan press.

Russia has no middle class such as is known in England — the class which has won the battle of liberalism. Russian capitalists, as a class, care for nothing but their profits, and feel perfectly happy under the present rule, inasmuch as bribery makes it very convenient for them. The people who feel unhappy are the intelligent, educated people, drawn

from all classes, but consisting mainly of men among the liberal professions and the gentry. These persons also fill a great many official posts in the administration, but mainly throng into the Zemstvos and town councils. They have missed no opportunity in urging the Government to take the path of legality, progress, and constitutionalism. To them the best side of Alexander II, and the carrying out of the emancipation and other standard reforms, were due; and there is no doubt that they would form a ready staff for constitutional government, if such were introduced.

That this portion of the Russian nation has also advanced in political maturity has been recently proved by the so-called Students' Strike. On February 20 the anniversary of the founding of the University of St. Petersburg was celebrated. After the proceedings the undergraduates, as well as the teaching personnel present, left for their homes; but they found the ice cut on the river which they had to cross, and the nearest bridge blocked by the police. The students, together with the ordinary pedestrians, about 500 people in all, turned to the next bridge; but they were followed and derided by some of the mounted police. A commotion ensued, and then the officer in command called for his detachment, crying "To the whips." He then led a charge on the defenceless crowd, the police striking right and left with their heavy whips, and shouting, "Lay on to the students!" and "We will not be hanged for this rabble!"

The news of the outrage spread very quickly, and produced a great stir not only among the undergraduates, but among the general public as well. Although meetings and all organizations among the pupils of the highest educational institutions are prohibited, the students of the university held crowded, but very orderly, meetings, and elected an agitation committee. Resolutions were passed to the effect that the undergraduates would abstain from attending lectures until the following points were granted by the Government:

- (1) That in case of force being used by the police a properly constituted court of justice should decide whether the use of such force was an actual necessity.
- (2) That the decision of such court must be arrived at and made known within a definite time.
- (3) That the rules regulating the conduct of the police toward the undergraduates be made public.

The first manifestation of sympathy with the university students and their action came from forty naval officers; then the Medical Academy joined in the strike. Over seventeen other of the highest educational institutions — both male and female — followed. At the same time

emissaries were dispatched to all similar institutions outside the capital; and very soon the universities and various institutes of Moscow, Khar-kov, Kiev, Kazan, Odessa, Warsaw, Alexandria, Riga, Dorpat, and distant Tomsk made common cause with St. Petersburg. A total of over 30,000 students abstained from attending lectures, and the Government was com-pelled to close all the higher educational institutions of the Empire. But still more telling was the fact that the older members of society, so far from blaming the youths and girls for their action, practically joined hands with them. Moreover, Mr. Witte, the Minister of Finance, who has been a rival of the late Home Secretary and has coveted his position, stepped forward in the capacity of the spokesman of society at large, and secured the support of four other higher officials in suggesting to the Tzar an inquiry into the whole matter, through an independent delegate. As before mentioned, General Vannovsky reported on the case consci-entiously, putting the blame at the doors of the police and the Home Office, and recommending the adoption of a better policy toward the students.

But now the helpless Young Man of All the Russias would not lis-ten to him. He issued a manifesto in which he blamed all the parties concerned in the Students' Strike, but mainly society at large for hav-ing "encouraged the disturbances by their approval, and by permitting themselves the uncalled-for liberty of intruding into the sphere of govern-mental activity." Attention has been again called to the episode, not to expose Nicholas II, but in order to bring home the fact, officially ac-nowledged, that educated society at large has shown itself far riper politi-cally, far more alive to the question of personal rights, than on many previous occasions. The educated class scored on this occasion a victory similar to that achieved by the workingmen of St. Petersburg. Mr. Gore-mikin, the Home Secretary, during whose administration the Students' Strike occurred, has just received his dismissal. It is not expected that matters will be much improved under his successor; but the strength of the movement is shown by the fact that the inability of Goremikin to prevent that movement was considered sufficient cause for dismissal.

The tale of Russian imperial misrule, of the obstacles put in the way of progress, is long and harrowing; but despondency is not its moral. The waste of energy caused in Russia by the present antiquated system of government is enormous; it is sufficient to make one's heart bleed and one's blood boil; yet it is not sufficient to stop altogether the pro-gress of the nation toward a freer and better and brighter day. In the relentless struggle between the vital forces of the people and the pitiless, all-grasping system of police tutelage, which makes every effort to keep

them down, there is always a balance, however small, in favor of progress. And it cannot be otherwise, because the Government, and that unfortunate legacy of our history which it represents, however reactionary in its tendencies, inspired by the instinct of self-preservation, must inevitably, to a certain extent, and in certain points, uphold with one hand what it tries to crush with the other.

Russia cannot maintain her present position among the nations — the position of a great international power — without competing with them in at least a certain amount of culture, social development, and progress. But progress is the deadliest enemy of Tzardom, as a system of rule, or, rather, misrule. This explains why the Russians are so sensitive to international opinion. Official, reactionary Russia watches that opinion with anxiety, as a barometer showing how far she is acknowledged to be a really international quantity. Popular, progressive Russia looks at that opinion with hope, as at a manifestation of the precious bond existing between herself and the universal progress of mankind. Remember this, that every token of fraternal feeling toward the Russian people — every manifestation of sympathy with their hopes — is an indirect, yet real, factor in bringing nearer the realization of those hopes. And it must not be forgotten that by bringing it nearer something is being accomplished not only for Russia, but also for the whole of mankind.

"Russia is a country which is yet to be discovered," said a periodical published in the Russian language, on the free soil of England. It will be discovered only when the fetters of tyranny shall have been removed. Then only will come the full bloom of the moral, artistic, and social wealth now potentially embodied in the race. The removal of these fetters will be a most important step toward bringing about a universal civilization; and, to use the words of a conscientious student of Russia — "It will be good to live in that day of resurrection." FELIX VOLKHOVSKY.

THE BOER WAR: A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE PREDICTION.

A LONG period will probably elapse before the final verdict of history is passed on the justice or injustice of the Boer war. But one conclusion is already indisputable. The opponents of the policy of the British Government have not needed to wait long for a complete vindication of their forecast of the probable course of events. Whether they are traitors or imbeciles — an alternative proposed by a distinguished London preacher — they have shown that they made a saner estimate of the immediate situation than was reached by any cabinet minister or any newspaper that expressed the popular sentiment. There is material here for quite an interesting study in comparative prediction.

In the first place, the fact that there has been war at all testifies to the foresight of the party commonly known as "pro-Boer." When Parliament rose in the summer of 1899, Mr. Chamberlain was confident that the mere dispatch of 10,000 men would solve the problem, without fighting at all. This display of force was going to overawe the Transvaal into complete surrender. Mr. Stead and his friends saw that the policy of bluff would be futile, and that it could end only in hostilities.

The action of the Orange Free State affords a similar contrast in fulfilled and unfulfilled prophecy. That in the event of war the two sister republics would be united was a familiar prediction of the minority long before the date of the ultimatum. On the other hand, Mr. Balfour declared that he no more dreamed of the possibility of having to fight the Orange Free State as well as the Transvaal than he did of the possibility of war with Switzerland. When the thing unexpected by Mr. Balfour actually happened, it was hailed with delight by most of the London papers, as facilitating the task of the British commanders. It would be so much easier to march directly north through the Free State, instead of having to treat that territory as neutral ground.

But it is in the respective forecasts of the two parties concerning the nature, length, and cost of the war, as a whole, that opportunity is given for the most interesting comparison. When Mr. Stead said, in Septem-

ber, 1899, that "for the next six months, at least, we shall have to keep a minimum of 50,000 men in South Africa," and that "there is considerable doubt as to whether we shall be able to recall any of them for a long time to come," he was thought to be raving mad.

A sufficient indication of the official estimate is given by the snub administered to General Sir William Butler. Sir Alfred Milner had instructed him to put a thousand men here and a thousand men there. He replied that, if there was to be war, three things would be necessary: (1) the immediate evacuation of northern Natal; (2) the occupation of the line of the Tugela by 20,000 men; and (3) the preparation of an army of 100,000 men to march on Pretoria. The rejection of this counsel led to Sir William Butler's resignation, in circumstances that made it equivalent to a dismissal.

A few extracts from the "Daily Mail," which more than any other paper represents the new Imperialism, make piquant reading to-day:

"It is certain that his (the Boer's) shooting has materially deteriorated, and that his waste of ammunition is ridiculous. His method of fighting, it is well known, is semi-barbaric. . . . A Boer commando will retreat in confusion if two men are killed." (September 21, 1899.)

"On the Natal side, the British troops are almost, if not quite, strong enough to attack. The combined armies of the two republics are not placed by good judges at much over 22,000 or 25,000 men. . . . There may be trifling reverses. We may feel assured that there will be no disaster — to the British flag." (October 11, 1899.)

"Their (the Boers') successes in the past were obtained against weak detachments, ill-handled, badly supplied with ammunition, or taken by surprise. They now find that our generals are risking no such small detachments, but that we are perfectly ready to accept battle with a fair field. They may, with their infantile strategy, calculate upon drawing our soldiers into ambushes, but they are likely to be grievously disappointed. At the outset they made the most disastrous mistake possible. Instead of concentrating every man on one point and advancing in one direction with the whole Boer force, they scattered commands in every direction — here 8,000 men, there 6,000, there 2,000, and so forth. By the time they have discovered their error the army corps will be upon them, ending forever the rule of a corrupt and incompetent oligarchy, which cries profanely to God to rescue it from the punishment which its countless sins have richly merited." (October 17, 1899.)

The military experts of the religious press were equally confident. In the "Methodist Times," the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes had no hesitation in asserting that the operations of "a few short weeks" would overthrow the Boer resistance. When after several weeks, which somehow did not seem very short, there was still little progress to report, he explained that he meant a few short weeks after Buller took command. That there would be a walk-over to Pretoria and that Sir Redvers Buller would eat his Christmas dinner in that capital, were, with the majority of the British public, essential articles of the patriotic faith. As the troops

departed for the front it was the fashion to label the officers' luggage, "For Pretoria."

Strange to say, the war party learned nothing from the dissipation of its early illusions. Though its first predictions had proved so erroneous, it persisted in making itself ridiculous. The surrender of Cronje at Paardeberg, on February 27, 1900, was interpreted as the beginning of the end. The occupation of Pretoria, early in June, was everywhere regarded as the end itself. But those troublesome "pro-Boers," in spite of the justification of their original predictions, had the audacity to contradict the prevailing prophecies once more. Said Mr. W. T. Stead, in "War Against War:"

"The morning newspapers, on the strength of Lord Rosslyn's telegram from Pretoria, announced the end of the war. That is nonsense. The war is not ended. The notion that the fall of Pretoria is equivalent to the conquest of the Transvaal is one of the persistent delusions which have deceived our people. We held Pretoria all through the war of 1881, and much good it did us. We may hoist a hundred flags in the capital of the South African Republic without ending the war. . . . We are not out of the wood by any means. We are, indeed, but entering the wood, with all our real difficulties still before us. We shall be lucky if we are able to declare the country pacified before Christmas."

The popular illusions respecting the seriousness of the war were naturally accompanied by miscalculations as to its cost. Just before the war broke out Mr. Stead's prediction, that "we shall get off cheaply if it does not cost us more than 10,000 lives and £20,000,000 sterling" was considered as ridiculous as his other warnings. But some time ago the bill already exceeded £100,000,000, while a moderate estimate of the present cost puts it at £2,000,000 a week. As to casualties, the official returns up to the end of December reported 51,687, including 12,158 deaths.

It is by this time clear that in his speech at Carnarvon (October 6, 1899) Mr. John Morley made the right retort to the sneer that he was a Cassandra. "Cassandra's prophecies," he replied, "happened to come true." There were, of course, many "pro-Boer" predictions which have not yet been verified, for the reason that sufficient time has not yet elapsed to test them. As so many others have been fulfilled, it may be worth while to record these also. Quotations might be made from many sources. Speaking at Arbroath, on September 6, 1899, Mr. Morley shadowed forth the following events as likely to ensue from a war, even though it were successful:

(1) "You will have sown the seeds of division between the Dutch and the English in Cape Colony."

(2) "You will have turned the Orange Free State into an enemy."

88 THE BOER WAR: A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE PREDICTION.

(3) "You will have stirred up a spirit of restlessness among the native population of South Africa."

(4) "You will have to set up a government which will be Ireland over again with what is called a loyalist district, and outside of that an enormous territory saturated with sullen disaffection."

(5) "For us to have 50,000 or 60,000 soldiers fighting in the Transvaal, with the certainty of having to keep a good many troops locked up there for an indefinite number of years to come, would assuredly not make us stronger, but considerably weaker, in any troubles that we might have with European powers."

Mr. Stead's forecast in his first pamphlet was practically identical, and not less vigorously expressed:

"As the result of war there are only two alternatives. Either we lose South Africa outright by finding the task of conquering the country and holding it beyond our power, or we create another Ireland within the Imperial fold, a disaffected, discontented community, which will seize every opportunity in order to harass the Government and create difficulties for the Empire. . . . Sooner or later we shall lose South Africa as we lost the United States." "The longer the war lasts," he said later, "and the more complete our victory, the more certain is our doom. The Imperial factor will be expelled from Africa by the combined forces of disappointed loyalty and exasperated Dutch sentiment."

Other public men, whose forecasts of the course of the war itself were equally unpopular and have been equally justified by events, speak with the same voice as Mr. Stead's respecting the ultimate issues. Mr. James Bryce's warning is that "the memory of bloodshed and of a war held to be unjust will fill an exceptionally tenacious race with a hatred far deeper and more lasting than the irritation which now exists — a hatred which may some day cost us our hold on South Africa." Mr. F. C. Selous, who startled his fellow-countrymen when the war broke out by predicting that it would last eighteen months, anticipates a time when the mineral wealth of South Africa will be exhausted, and when the Boers will be in an overwhelming preponderance — the Europeans having left the country. The end he foresees is that the British policy "will inevitably lose us the whole of South Africa as a British possession within the lifetime of many men who are now living."

It is quite unnecessary to set forth in contrast the predictions now made by those who believed in October, 1899, that the war would be over by Christmas of the same year, and who were equally sure in June, 1900, that there would be no more serious fighting. Whether their new certainties will have a better fate than the old ones, time only can show. What has already happened is enough to give point to Lord Rosebery's question in that section of his rectorial address which criticised the statesmanship of the day: "Do we," he asked, "anticipate or follow events?"

HERBERT W. HORWILL.

THE NATIONS IN COMPETITION AT THE CLOSE OF THE CENTURY.

ENGLAND's decline in commerce is a theme so persistently discussed, not only by her rivals, but by her own statesmen and public men generally, that we may excuse our own people if they take up the cry and prepare to accept the heirship thus opened to them. They do not hesitate to parcel out the lion's skin, though the lion is not by any means dead; nor is his condition one that would lead us to hope of his leaving the field at an early date.

The chief error in discussing the question of trade arises from the fact that few are acquainted with the fundamental conditions producing results; hence the fact that a few isolated items in which deficiency has been discovered are taken as illustrative of general decline, and the question is treated as a whole without any attempt at specialization or analysis. The only countries that can be considered, in speaking of possible successors to British trade dominion, are Germany and the United States. France is content with a continued improvement of the well-being of her own citizens. She is well satisfied if remunerative employment can be found for her toiling millions along the line of her strength, in industries where the deftness of hand and the inborn taste of her people can easily hold the field as a monopoly; while she would be poorly fitted for a contest with nations engaged in a fierce struggle in the domain of the "Gross-industrie." Though by no means backward in adopting the best methods of production in the great industries, she adheres preferably to the older methods wherever the hand is well fitted to attain results and is not too much handicapped by machine production in price.

Many may think this a mistaken archaism; but it will be seen a little later on that France has economic advantages in her system that could not be outdone by a possible saving in the labor cost, were the factory to take the place of the house industry. In a report to the State Department on Boots and Shoes, in August, 1888, I showed that ladies' button boots were made at Lynn, Massachusetts, at a labor cost

of 35 cents; the corresponding cost being 57 cents at Berlin, and 61 to 64 cents at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and at Leicester and Stafford, England.

Now, whatever the advantages accruing from these facts to our shoe manufacturers in the neutral markets of the world, it would be a mistake to suppose that a great trade could ever be established in the other countries on account of the cheaper labor cost in America. The factory price, even where no duties intervene to raise the export price, is increased by freight and other charges, and by the profit of the importer, who is seldom the distributor to the consumer. In fact, the latter is not infrequently charged with three profits, that of the manufacturer, the importing merchant, and the retailer. Now, the shoemaker working on his bench, having only his labor to regard, has a very great advantage even in countries where shoe manufacturing on the American plan has taken root.

This explains the slow development of the shoe factory in these countries. The enumeration of 1895 showed for Germany 237,160 shoemaking establishments, with 388,443 persons employed. Only 27,264 of these worked in aggregates of more than fifty persons; leaving but one person and a half to be accounted for by each of the 236,902 establishments still left in the field for the employment of the remaining 361,179 persons engaged in the industry. In regard to France, this holds good in a more marked degree; as the aversion to machine employment characteristic of France, and of her people to machine-made goods, does not exist in Germany.

The printed calicoes of Mulhouse are world renowned. They add to the trade lists of Germany. But their traditions are French. The care as to details is characteristic of French methods. The size of orders in special selections of colors and patterns, implying a change of rollers, color boxes, etc., would discourage even the printers of Elberfeld. The studios of the designers employed in the works, when Alsace was still under French dominion, have been closed and transferred to Paris, where the printers find that the ideals of beauty in color and design can be better expressed than they can be at the works themselves.

During a visit to Professor Reuleaux, in Berlin, in 1887, I was asked by the professor what I thought of German industries. "What you said in your report on German industries, in 1876, 'Schlecht und billig,'" I replied. This blunt expression seemed to shock the professor. On being asked how the information leading to this view was obtained, I answered, "At the show-windows of the leading stores"; and added, "It

is to be presumed that the best and not the poorest pieces are exposed to public view."

In order to correct these first impressions, Professor Reuleaux kindly offered to take me around to the principal works in art-industries to show me the progress that had been actually made. Not satisfied with the first results of our tour of observation, he took me to a foundry where artistic articles were made. But here too few objects inviting our interest were forthcoming. He asked what had become of the real bronzes they had undertaken to produce some time before. The reply was: "Oh, we have given them up; we could not make any profit on them; and you American gentlemen are the cause of it. You want everything cheaper, cheaper, cheaper, till finally all profit is taken away, and our people will not buy costly pieces." "But Barbedienne in Paris," I replied, "employs the great artists to make the models, and they continue to increase the business through the fame of their work." "Oh, that is Paris. They have the fame, and we have to be satisfied with imitations and casts of composition metal."

This incident is worth repeating as illustrative of the position gained by France in industries in which the world pays her willing tribute. The system by which small manufacturers distribute work among working people, the products being collected by middlemen for home and foreign trade, is well calculated to remain popular. For causes to which I have referred, cheapness of the more modern system cannot plead for its suppression. The employment of large capital in the erection of mills is unnecessary here, and causes the manufacturer to prefer the old system; and work distributed into remote country districts even is a great help to large numbers of people employed in agriculture and other occupations during part of the year. In many industries, silk weaving for instance, gas and electric motors and other small-power engines, which furnish power at small cost, make it possible to combine, where an economic advantage can be shown, the benefits of both systems.

Germany, by means of her universities and polytechnic high-schools, has created a class of scientific experts whose influence is felt in the color and chemical industries on the one hand, and in metallurgy, machine construction, and the electrical industries on the other. She is extending machine employment, and is pressing England in many of her products in her own domain. Articles of every-day use exposed in all shop windows, and labelled "made in Germany," need not be very extensive articles of commerce, and can still be very offensive sights to the home manufacturer done out of the trade. I pointed out in a previous num-

ber of THE FORUM,¹ that, with the exception of the metal industries, the great staple industries are safely ensconced in the hands of Great Britain, and that the share falling to Germany is not greatly increased as years go by. The latest trade reports show no perceptible change. The exports in cotton goods, bleached, colored, and printed, were 63 million marks in 1896, and 67 millions in 1898. In hosiery, the figures fell from 58 millions to 52 millions in the same period. This article is especially favored by foreign customers of Germany.

In laces and embroideries, where machinery has been advantageously introduced in competition with Switzerland, the trade has increased from 14 millions to 29 millions, because the fashions in these ornaments were favorable. Earthenware and porcelain fell from 45 to 43 millions. Gloves rose from 42 to 46 millions. Paper and paperware rose from 63 to 68 million marks. Articles of clothing, including underwear, fell from 120 to 95 millions. In silks and half silks the difference lay between 101 millions, in 1896, and 106 millions, in 1898; and in wool manufactures of all kinds the figures for the same years were 210 millions and 197 millions, respectively. In chemicals, colors, etc., the exports rose from 324 million to 329 million marks.

The total sum of exports comprising the chief manufacturing industries, outside of the metal industries, was 1,034 million marks (246 million dollars) in 1896, and 1,026 million marks (244 million dollars) in 1898. As the recent years have been years of great prosperity and commercial expansion for all of Germany, and as the reaction in 1900 from overstimulated trade was not even anticipated, this showing does not indicate a distinct forward movement. In metals and metal manufactures, inclusive of machinery, instruments, and apparatus of all kinds, the exports rose from 630.8 million marks (151 million dollars) to 737.3 million marks (177 million dollars).

The year 1899–1900 was perhaps the most prosperous year Germany has seen since the collapse in 1873, similarly ushered in by expansion and wild speculation, for which the metallic industries always offer so inviting a field. A few figures may illustrate the rapid growth in recent years. The production of iron ore in 1894 was 8,433,784 metric tons; in 1899 it was 11,975,272 tons. The production of pig-iron in the same time rose from 5,559,322 tons to 8,029,305 tons. But consumption over-reached this by 440,599 tons, which amount had to be imported from abroad, and was chiefly supplied by Great Britain. The ores consumed in this product were supplemented by those from Swe-

¹ "Exports and Wages," January, 1898.

den, Spain, Luxemburg, and Lorraine. The output of coal in 1894 was 76,741,100 tons, and of lignites (*Braunkohle*) in the same year was 22,-064,600 tons; while in 1899 it was 101,621,866 tons and 34,202,561 tons, respectively, an increase of thirty-five per cent in the brief period of five years. A principal part of the coal is from the Ruhr basin, which is favorably situated for the support of the great iron and steel industries of Westphalia; itself possessed of extensive coal measures in the very centres of its industries. Coke production went hand in hand with this great demand upon the iron industries, and rose from 8,201,144 tons to 11,400,000 tons in the period just mentioned.

The management of the iron, coal, coke, and steel industries, and their larger branch industries, has been gradually brought into the hands of syndicates. These regulate the output. They divide the orders among the best-fitted concerns, regulate prices, and determine all questions of internal and external policy. With rising prices and a large demand the system has worked well. Altogether the syndicates have pursued a conservative policy. The export trade has been fostered, not infrequently to the detriment of home consumers. During the coal famine, iron producers, with banked fires for want of fuel, have had the mortification of seeing the loaded coal and coke trains pass their furnaces on the way to the shipping ports.

But the syndicates claim to count upon the times of declining trade, and say that it is more difficult to resume connections once broken than to secure new ones. The not over-abundant supply of good coking coal would seem to indicate that it would be good policy to look to home industry as a field to be favored. But nations trade as units only in the standard works and text-books of economic philosophy, while in reality they trade through the medium of individuals. Therefore, the process of denuding countries of their mineral wealth for the benefit of foreign competitors will undoubtedly be continued.

So far no better cure for ills of an economic nature has been found than unrestricted exchange of commodities. That the coal and iron producers of Germany have no cause to find fault with the system that guides production and distribution may be presumed from the dividends that have been paid, and the prices at which the shares have been selling, and are still selling, on the Bourse. The patriotic legend, that where the benefit of the whole country is enhanced the interest of the individual must give way, finds ready acquiescence. The good of the country may demand things diametrically opposed to each other. The fact is that the German manufacturer submits to the imposition of the syndicates, seeing

that he can recoup himself in his prices, just as the American woollen manufacturer willingly submits to taxes on his raw material, as long as the consumer is laid at his feet in the fetters of a protective tariff prohibitive in degree.

Valuable information is furnished by Mr. C. Kirchhoff, the editor of "The Iron Age," in a pamphlet recently published by him, from observations on the spot, in the summer of 1900. According to a table representing fifty leading collieries of Westphalia, the collieries of the largest production averaged about $6\frac{1}{2}$ marks (\$1.50) per metric ton. The mines of smaller capacity averaged about $7\frac{1}{2}$ marks. The selling prices at the pit's mouth for the same year averaged 9.70 marks, and in May of that year 10.30 marks.

The coke makers show still better evidence of thrift. The selling price at ovens in 1887 was \$1.88 to \$2.09 per ton. In 1898 it was \$3.36 for furnace coke, and \$3.90 for foundry coke. For 1900 the syndicate fixed the price of furnace coke at the oven at \$3.36, and raised it to \$4.08 for 1901. Mr. Kirchhoff says on the question of cost:

"It is pretty certain that coking coal at 8 marks, or say \$2.00, per ton yields a moderate profit to the colliery, and that there is good reason to believe that with by-product ovens the value of the gas, sulphate of ammonia, tar, etc., more than pays for the cost of coking."

We can fully accept his views as illustrative of the situation when he says:

"It is quite evident that the coke makers of the Ruhr district, who are now getting \$3.50 per gross ton and have contracted for next year's delivery at \$4.25 per gross ton, are having, in slang phrase, a very good thing of it, and that they can afford liberally to subsidize those German iron works which are throwing the gauntlet into the international arena."

Wages have risen; but this factor has been insignificant in proportion to the great profits that have accrued to the coal and iron industries in recent years. Miners' wages averaging $88\frac{1}{2}$ cents (3.73 marks) a day in 1894 have risen to \$1.09 (4.55 marks); day-laborers' wages in the same time have advanced from $56\frac{1}{2}$ cents (2.35 marks) to $64\frac{1}{2}$ cents (2.67 marks). As wages are usually gauged by the output, advances are apt to be lost in times of declining trade.

Enlargement and improvement of plants have been undertaken in some of the iron and steel plants. But, as a rule, manufacturers are willing to let well enough alone. The low wage rates allow them to attain scales of cost fully as satisfactory as those of their transatlantic competitors, without the necessity of tying up immense capital in pro-

ductive machinery, which is apt to consume both profit and capital in times of commercial depression.

The "yellow terror" has received a quietus lately by the helplessness and utter collapse of the Celestial Empire, caused by the attack of the few thousand Europeans sent to the rescue of the foreign ambassadors. However, there remains the "white terror," which the statesmen of the press have been actively pushing forward for years, to keep their readers in awe. Size and numbers, if sufficiently large, convey the impression of gigantic power. A centralized power of restless enterprise is thought to be opening up a new world power in an economic sense. The hundred million inhabitants of European Russia deserve to be noted, especially when we see great enterprises, supported by European capital, developing all over the Russian Empire.

Those, however, who judge Russia's strength from impressions gained by statistical reports scarcely understand her internal weakness. Scarcely fifteen per cent of her population live in towns; and of the inhabitants of towns a large proportion depend for a living on the soil. Poverty is but a mild expression for the state of their existence. The emancipation act freed the peasant; but while he is free from the ownership of the landlord, he is still a slave. The land allotted for cultivation by the peasant does not increase with the growth of the population. The admired institution of the Mir holds sway over him from his birth to his grave. The Mir assigns the strips according to the quality of the land, and directs every act of the cultivator, from ploughing to seeding and harvesting. Obedience to custom, inborn stolidity, and general ignorance have removed the improvement of method of cultivation from the field of probabilities. Thus, ridiculously small crops in a country favored with a soil of great richness become the evidence of the economic backwardness of a naturally gifted people. Years of famine come in more and more frequent succession. But whether plenty or starvation sets up its banner, the taxes, by means of which the barbaric show of a huge military empire is upheld, are collected with equal strenuousness.

The mineral resources of the Empire would seem to enable Russia to satisfy her ambitious desires. Coal and iron are found in abundance; and great works have been erected at Ekaterinoslav, in close proximity to the Donets coal-fields. But labor is not very productive here. Better progress has been made in the district of Poland, where German capital and management largely direct industrial enterprise. From 1890 to 1897, the production of pig-iron in the Empire rose from 926,000 to 1,747,000 tons, and of coal from 6,015,000 to 8,287,000 tons. Of the latter, Po-

land contributed nearly one-half. Charcoal is still largely used in pig-iron production. As the coal of Poland is not fitted for coking, large quantities of coke are imported, for the use of the iron-makers, by way of the Baltic from England, and by rail (about three-fourths of the total) from Germany.

The efficiency of labor diminishes with the distance from the Western frontier. Coal mining depends so much on the character of the mines — the thickness of seams, etc. — and the method of working, that the output per hand cannot always be taken as an index of the working capacity of the man. Yet the discrepancy is so great that the difference cannot be credited entirely to the differences in application of steam power, the varying thicknesses of the coal veins, etc. "The output of the Polish and Donets coal-fields always nearly equal each other." Yet, for the same period, 8,692 hands were employed in the former, and 25,167 in the latter.

The investigations made in the cotton industries by Professor Jan-schull, of the University of Moscow, and by Professor Schultze-Gaevertz show similar effects of working capacity. Here Estonia and Poland again show the greatest approach to Western efficiency of labor. In Russia, the expense of management is especially high. In two Russian mills it is quoted, for six months, at 519 and 465 roubles, respectively, per 1,000 spindles; while in English mills it is quoted as low as 14 roubles (\$7). The official Russian report to which I have alluded states the cost of labor per poud (36 pounds) of No. 24 yarn as 81 kopecks, *i.e.*, $2\frac{1}{4}$ kopecks, or $1\frac{1}{8}$ cents, per pound. Other items in spinning mills in the Petersburg district (Narwa, Estonia), exclusive of fuel, however, add $1\frac{3}{8}$ cents, so that the total cost per pound stands at $2\frac{1}{8}$ cents.

On personal investigations in American and English mills, the writer found the labor cost in a mill at Lowell, Mass., spinning an average of No. $32\frac{1}{2}$, to be 1.992 cents, and all other items of expense covered in the Russian account, 0.955 cents = total 2.947 cents. A Lancashire mill spinning an average of No. $37\frac{1}{2}$ had an average cost of 1.708 for labor, and 1.38 cents for other items, total 3.088 cents. These are much higher numbers than the Russian yarn here quoted, but are produced at about an equal general cost. This brings the total spinning cost of No. $32\frac{1}{2}$ in Massachusetts and No. $37\frac{1}{2}$ in Lancashire to about the level of No. 24 yarn in the Moscow mills. The cost of No. 32 in the Russian mills is 2.94

¹"The Industries of Russia," an official work compiled for the World's Columbian Exposition, under the auspices of the Russian Government.

roubles per poud, or $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents the pound,¹ in the same items of labor and expense. High rates of duties place the internal trade completely into the hands of Russian manufacturers. But it would be futile for them, under the circumstances described, to attempt competition in a world where the ukase of the Czar does not hold sway, except after a complete revolution of conditions.

In THE FORUM for January, 1898, the increase of the export trade of the United States during the period from 1885 to 1897 was dwelt upon by the present writer. In articles of manufacture in metals, chiefly machinery, agricultural implements, instruments, and apparatus, the exports had increased from \$14,893,000 to \$51,828,000. In the same lines the figure for 1900 was \$74,681,000. In all other manufactures in metals, \$5,950,000 and \$21,444,000 mark the figures for 1886 and 1897, respectively. In 1900 the total for these articles rose to \$41,891,000. Crude iron and steel, *i.e.*, pig, bar, and hoop iron, and steel in plates, sheets, and rails were exported in 1886 to the extent of 13,026 tons, and in 1897 to the extent of 289,893 tons. The exports in these in 1900 amounted to 747,095 tons. The exports of copper were \$31,075,636 in 1897, and \$55,772,166 in 1900. The increase of eighty per cent in value is, however, accompanied by an increase of twenty per cent only in the tonnage exported.

Exports of refined petroleum — which is classed with the manufactures in the Treasury statements of exports, as is the case also with crude copper, in ingots and bars — amounted to \$51,242,933 in 1898, and grew to \$67,740,106 in 1900. But that this increase in value benefited any one outside of the owners of the stock of the oil companies may be doubted, in view of the fact that the exports in gallons were about ten per cent less in 1900 than in 1898, *i.e.*, 900,978,875 in 1898 against 817,594,099 in 1900.

Copper and petroleum are gifts of nature, and the distribution of these products abroad depends, of course, on the absorbing capacity of foreign countries. In the basic materials of iron and steel, as well as in their manufactures, America is favored beyond comparison. The latter now

¹ It will be instructive to compare the average weekly wages paid in Russian, American, and English spinning mills.

WEEKLY WAGES PAID IN COTTON MILLS.

| | Moscow. | Poland. | Lancashire. | Massachusetts. |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------|
| Mule spinners | \$2.00 to \$3.75 | \$4.25 to \$4.50 | \$7.68 to \$9.72 | \$10.38 |
| Cardroom hands | .87 " 1.25 | 2.00 " 2.50 | \$3.60 | 5.04 |

form the bulk of our exports in manufactures. To bring the materials to a point where they could be advantageously united and manufactured into products of use, capable of entering foreign markets in successful competition with similar articles produced by labor remunerated at a much lower rate of wages than ours — this was the work of genius. Efforts in this direction have been made for a decade at least, but they have been brought to the notice of the world in the last few years only. All other manufactures, including cotton goods, leather and its manufactures, and wood manufactures, amounted to 89 millions in 1897, and to 124 millions in 1900.

Much has been said about our capacity to conquer foreign markets against Great Britain in cotton goods. Beyond an expansion in the coarser yarn fabrics our progress has not been very rapid. To one knowing the field and the merchandise this is not surprising. Our trade in uncolored goods in 1896 amounted to \$9,539,000, and in 1900 to \$13,229,000, an increase of \$4,000,000, or about fifty per cent. But this is due to one single field absorbing more of our goods. Our exports in cotton goods to China were \$3,854,000 in 1896 and \$8,783,134 in 1900. The chief exports of Great Britain go to southern countries, where lighter weights and finer counts are in demand. England is able to sell a sightlier fabric and for less money than we can sell it. The thread is more even in their fabric than in ours, and the goods in general have a better finish. In colored goods, haste and immensity of production preclude the possibility of our turning out fabrics that are as pleasing to the expert's eye as those produced by England, or of catering to the tastes of as many peoples as are catered to by England. Our trade in these has not materially risen since 1894, when it amounted to \$3,855,000; for in 1900 it amounted to \$4,839,000 only.

The class of cotton goods which China buys of us is one in which cheapness is the most important consideration; evenness in the thread and absence of weavers' imperfections being of secondary importance only. And here the recently developed cotton industry in the South finds a very responsive field. But it would be an error to suppose that no greater efforts toward perfection than those made by our mills for the supply of our own wants would be necessary to conquer and hold other markets in the cotton-goods trade. It is one thing to control a field when all outside competitors are excluded, and quite another thing to be confronted on equal terms by products showing the results of hereditary skill and of all the technical advantages which a hundred years of effort and experience have disseminated throughout the trade.

It would be futile to expect the United States to look for other markets than her own in the other textile branches. Even if the price were satisfactory, much progress would be required to bring the color and finish in silks up to the standard of European goods, such as are turned out by Lyons, and in half-silk goods, by Crefeld. In woollens one need only observe the fabrics displayed in the stores or worn by the people to note the low character of the materials turned out by over-protected mills. Cotton and shoddy are displacing wool to an increasing extent. Although little foreign clothing-wool is imported, yet the domestic stocks are accumulating in storehouses and in the producers' hands.¹ The dog-in-the-manger policy has seldom brought other results.

It was only when keen competition and oversupply compelled us to turn our eyes to other trade openings that improvements were brought about. The iron industry up to ten years ago suffered in such ways. The hard times following 1893, more than anything else, have brought on changes which no one connected with the industry had thought possible. The Wilson tariff in 1894 nearly stranded on the rocks of senatorial opposition, on account of the persistence of Democratic senators in obeying the industrial demands for high rates of duty on coal, and on iron and steel and their manufactures. Now that our goods can be landed at English mill doors on a par with English goods, few of the insatiabiles would be hardy enough to plead for a maintenance of these duties, were it not that reasons have never been wanting, in the face of facts, to prove to the willing ears of the lawmakers the desirability, if not the necessity, of their continuation.

What, now, is England's danger in industrial competition? England can only pay for her ever-increasing food bill with the produce of her mills. What is her position? Is she really falling behind? Perhaps her politicians and statesmen would not become alarmed if they were not prompted by the fact that leader writers and "experts" are filling the columns of the metropolitan press. But lords and cabinet ministers cannot be expected to be well informed on the trivial matters that make up a nation's work-shop accounts. However, they could know a little about the general figures of the world's trade which are to be set against England's figures. And here, outside of iron and steel and their manufactures, one cannot well understand why England's forecast should be so gloomy.

¹ On the basis of what appears to be a careful investigation, it was estimated by a trade journal that the stocks of wool in the country at the end of December, 1900, were 352,000,000 pounds against 157,000,000 pounds in the same month of the preceding year.

The totals of exports of Germany and Great Britain have grown since 1895 as follows (in millions and their decimals):

| | Germany. | Great Britain. |
|------------|---------------|----------------|
| 1895 | Marks 3,424.1 | \$821 |
| 1897 | 3,786.2 | 908 |
| 1898 | 4,010.6 | 962 |
| 1899 | 4,368.9 | 1,048 |
| 1900 | 4,556.3 | 1,098 |
| | | |
| | £226.1 | \$1,096 |
| | 284.2 | 1,135 |
| | 233.3 | 1,131 |
| | 264.5 | 1,280 |
| | 291.4 | 1,413 |

The cotton-goods trade of England supplies the greatest single item in these totals. Such exports exceed in magnitude those of the metal industries. Cotton manufactures of all kinds and yarns amounted in 1899 to 67½ million pounds sterling, while all metals and manufactures exported, including machinery, cycles, and apparatus (but not ships), amounted to 61 million pounds. It is true that the average of cottons and cotton yarn exports for the five years preceding 1891 was 72 million pounds. But it must be borne in mind, in connection with this, that the average export price of cotton for the five years preceding 1891 was 10 cents, while the average for the years up to and including 1899 was 7.3 cents, and for 1899 but 6.88 cents per pound. It is but natural that trade with countries fostering their home manufactures by high tariffs should become reduced. But the trade with countries outside of this pale is enlarging. That this trade is held very closely by Great Britain is not only proved by the figures underlying this statement, but is further corroborated by the insignificant showing of Germany and the United States, the only possible competitors of England. Her peculiar capacity for leading other nations in those manufactures in which she has taken deep root by reason of conditions intrinsically her own cannot be denied and must be recognized.

There is a certain fitness, dependent, perhaps, on climate and a hereditary aptitude among working people, which cannot be transplanted, try as we may. In worsteds, especially in the woollen line, no other nation could come anywhere near English perfection at the low prices at which these goods are produced. On the other hand, England has never been able to compete with Germany in the soft fabrics made of fine wools for ladies' dresses, cashmeres, henriettas, and the like, or with France in challis. Still, with all the drawbacks that may be named, supported by the loss of trade with America — which, under all the tariffs preceding the Dingley tariff, had been a lucrative customer of England — the exports in woollens, worsteds, and yarns amounted in 1900 to £21,700,000.

In articles of wear, including hats, exports were slightly higher in 1900 than in 1896, amounting to £8,036,000 in 1900 against

£7,852,000 in 1896; thus equalling in these lines the exports of Germany, France, and the United States combined. In boots and shoes a decline has been perceptible in recent years. For 1896, the exports were £1,799,030, marking, with two exceptions, the highest figure ever reached. In 1900 the amount was only £1,488,000. We are justified in ascribing this circumstance to the successful competition of the United States, whose exports rose from \$1,436,636 in 1896 to \$4,274,174 in 1900. The greater part of this went to British colonies, but \$950,267 went to England direct.

Important as the questions arising from these conditions may be, they sink into insignificance before the all-around preponderance of iron and steel and their manufactures. All the progress of the age is dependent on two minerals, coal and iron. Those who possess these dominate the world-trade. Their products, turned into rails and machines, have changed the aspect of the world. It is small wonder that the demand for them should be a growing one. I cannot here enter into the question of the extent of the natural resources at the disposal of the countries now successfully employing these gifts of nature in the world's trade. I shall only speak of the capacity of these countries at the shipping point. Until a few years ago the leadership of the world was uncontestedly in the hands of England; and she may well be amazed at seeing her own domains broken into by such upstarts, as it were, as Germany "saddled with her military burdens," and America "with her high wages." Until recently, our country was one of England's best customers. Is the growth of these rivals a sign of England's retrogression? Or can they maintain their new position only by keeping in mind England's established priority and eminence?

Trade figures show that the latter assumption is the correct one. In metals and their manufactures, excepting machinery, England's exports were 31 million pounds in 1896; 30 million pounds in 1898; 37 million pounds in 1899, and 45 million pounds in 1900. In machinery and mill-work 1896 showed £15,463,000, while 1898 showed £16,592,-000, and 1900 showed £19,621,000. The mainstay of her industry (coal) was exported in larger volume in 1900 than in any preceding year; amounting to £38,600,000 in 1900, against £23,093,000 in 1899, next to the highest figure ever reached. Most of this increase is due to the great rise in prices. The tonnage was 46 million tons in 1900 against 43 millions in 1899. The exports in 1890 were only 30 million tons.

The tonnage in all forms of iron and steel has been equally well maintained. In steel rails, however, a falling-off is distinguishable from the

high-water marks of 1887 to 1891. This has been due largely to the unevenness of demand inherent in this article, and in the last three years to the competition of America, which carried off many of the contracts that otherwise would have been taken by England. That this has been possible is accepted as a proof that England is not able to maintain herself against her youngest competitor.

These assumptions are all based on the trade history of the last few years, *i.e.*, since shipments of iron and of steel have been made to England. They have been years of high prices in England; and if she was able to buy our pig-iron and other forms of iron and steel in 1898 and 1899, and pay freight and charges, then this only proves that she was so well employed that for a long time she could command better remuneration for her work than we could here, under all the depressing influences affecting the iron trade in America up to the spring of 1899. But it proves nothing about the potentiality of England. Her capacity for profit-taking when the conditions are favorable is not surpassed by any country, not even by us. The strength of the chain is its weakest link, and the latter is uncommonly strong in England. With all her antiquated appliances, a dozen years ago, and her humdrum methods of labor and management, the cost of production was not much higher than it is at the best-appointed works in America to-day, and would not have exceeded one dollar in a ton of steel. Moreover, England's collieries, coke works, iron mines, steel works, and furnaces are, for the most part, situated at tide-water or at the mouths of rivers.

For collecting the materials at the shipping point, England has facilities not equalled by any other country. In the Cleveland district (Middlesborough and neighborhood), which produced thirty-seven per cent of the entire iron production of 1898, the furnaces are so situated that they can receive the iron ore — from the mines as well as from the ships bringing foreign ores for their Bessemer iron — direct at the furnace yard. Coke from the Durham ovens can be delivered at the furnace, in normal times, at ten shillings (\$2.43), inclusive of freight.

The cheapest iron in America is made in Alabama. In 1898 it was sold as low as \$6.50 for No. 2 iron. Bessemer iron in the same year was as low as \$8.50 in the Ohio Valley, and \$9.50 in Pittsburg. The low prices at which iron was selling were sufficiently remunerative, it seems, to enable the Tennessee Coal & Iron Company, the largest single producer in Alabama, to pay its interest charge at six per cent on a bonded debt of \$10,000,000. The subsequent rise of Southern iron to \$17.50 and of Bessemer iron to \$25 is no more indication of a change

in capacity than is the British change in selling price. In 1886, Cleveland iron of the same class as Southern iron sold in Great Britain at 26 shillings per ton (\$6.32). It was said that it could not be made at that price. Indeed, the cost sheets which I collected from a number of the largest makers in and around Middlesborough show as high as 33 shillings. But the ore and coke prices seem to have been taken at market rates and at higher figures than those at which they were actually obtained, as most of the large producers are owners of ore beds and coke works.

Mr. Kirchhoff places the cost at 30 shillings (\$7.20). One producer of pig iron had given me 28 shillings as his price in 1888 in his statement of the cost of making bar iron. With allowance for increase in wages, the present cost may be slightly larger; but as this increase is largely counterbalanced by certain improvements which have been since introduced, the cost is probably not in excess of \$7.50. The selling price at the end of 1900, when prices had somewhat slackened, was 65 shillings (\$15.80). The cost of labor per ton of pig-iron, judging by statements obtained from the best furnaces, was on the average 3s. 6d. (85 cents). This brings the labor cost of Cleveland iron to 97 cents, and of Bessemer iron to 79 cents. With the improvements which have been made since then, by adopting higher blast, etc., it is now possible, according to the authority just quoted, to make iron at a labor cost of 61 cents.

American furnaces have seen great improvements. The carting of the material to the lift has been done away with. The newer furnaces raise the materials on inclined planes, and dump them at the cupola, with the aid of automatic appliances. Labor cost now averages about as low as that just stated for Middlesborough. The labor cost in Westphalia, Luxemburg, Lorraine, and in the adjacent French iron district is from 60 to 75 cents. The Luxemburg, Lorraine, and French furnaces could produce cheaper iron if they were not handicapped in coke, which has to be transported from the Ruhr district, or from Belgium, at a cost of 8 marks per ton.

Besides the transportation of one material or another to the collecting point, the French and German iron and steel works are obliged also to consider the distance from the furnace to tide water. This applies in a greater or less degree to Northern furnaces in America, but not to Alabama or the other Southern iron districts. The distance to tide water is, however, a handicap to Northern and Southern producers alike, as against England. Improvements through science and inven-

tion cannot possibly annul this advantage. The possible saving in labor cost from the ore to the finished steel can be in fractions of a dollar only. According to data obtained on personal visits to works, the cost in England, in 1888, was about \$3 per ton; and the cost of making steel rails of basic iron, allowing $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons of pig-iron to the ton of rails, was but \$3.79 from the ore to the finished rails. American and German steel makers cannot greatly improve upon this figure, though England may have been remiss in remodelling her plants.

The great expansion in the exports of machinery by Germany and America is due to the fact that the world is becoming more and more a machine and tool using world. Driven by her high rate of wages, America has paved the way. But England and Germany are adopting our ways, and are modifying our system to meet their special needs. But with the great diversity of needs the world over, it is not necessary for one to decline in order that another may have a chance. The truth of this assertion is seen from the fact that England's exports of machinery, implements, apparatus, etc., which in 1875 were 38 million dollars, had increased to 100 million dollars by 1900; that Germany's $16\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars in 1875 grew to 60 million dollars by 1900; and that America's 10 million dollars in 1875 grew to 50 million dollars by 1900. The foreign trade of the three leading countries in machinery has grown from \$64,000,000 to \$210,000,000, and of this England has still the lion's share. Indeed, she does more than half of the world's trade in this line; for we must remember that she adds \$45,000,000 annually to these exports in the shape of iron ships which she builds for foreign account.

The subject cannot be pursued into details here, as the general reader is not interested in technical matters. But this question of trade is now the pinnacle of thought, and I believe it is serving a useful purpose to remind the good people of America of the continued existence of old John Bull and his persistent work at his bench.

JACOB SCHOENHOF.

THE MACHIAVELLI OF CHINESE DIPLOMACY.

THE peace negotiations at Peking call to mind the inexperience of the ministers who are negotiating with the Chinese statesmen. The American minister has had about three years of contact with the East; the British minister has been in Peking less than a year; the Russian minister has been at his post a shorter time than the American; and the French representative is a novice in dealing with the Celestial.

Opposed to these keen but new diplomatists sits the wrinkled veteran, Earl Li Hung Chang, with his associate Prince Ching. Of Li's seventy-eight years, the last forty have been largely spent in crossing swords with European and American representatives of statecraft. This prince of Oriental sword-warriors has fought with Sir Frederick Bruce, Sir Thomas Wade, Sir Harry S. Parkes, Sir John Walsham, Sir Nicholas O'Connor, Sir Claude MacDonald; Hon. Anson Burlingame, Hon. George F. Seward, Hon. Charles Denby; MM. Rochechouart, Patenotre, Fournier, Cogodan; Marquis Ito; Count Muravieff, and scores of other first-class diplomatic lances.

He knows every thrust and every parry; he has hunted out every seam in the armor; and he can cut into every unprotected, vital point. He has come into the negotiations to represent the humiliated power; but there is reason to believe that he is better prepared to fight a losing battle than would be all his opponents combined. The white emissaries have shown by two great failures that they are not yet prepared to cope with the yellow man. In September, 1898, they knew nothing of the *coup d'état* until it was past; and they, by doing nothing, permitted the reign of reaction, conservatism, and terror to gain headway. In 1900 they refused to believe that this reaction and conservatism were culminating. Not until the Boxers imprisoned them in Peking did they realize that there was a Boxer uprising. They are now backed by force, that is their hope of success — I say it with all respect. Given a fair field and no favor, Earl Li would deftly set them to quarrelling as to who should lead in the assault, who should have his hat, coat, and shoes, with the result that he would remain intact, while they would wonder how it all happened.

Earl Li is a striking, if not a great, figure. He is a fascinating study. The foreign diplomacy of China, for forty years, has been his. In Chinese politics he is a past master. He came into prominence as Governor of Kiangsu, in the sixties. This is the province of which Soochow is the capital, and Shanghai and Nanking are the commercial and literary metropoles. Because of his services in suppressing the Taiping Rebellion, a vaster struggle than our Civil War, he was made guardian of the heir apparent — a position similar to that recently held by Prince Tuan — was granted the Yellow Jacket, and was made assistant Grand Councillor of the Empire.

In 1868 he stepped into a Viceroyalty, and, with Wuchang as his capital, ruled over Hupei and Hunan, as Chang Chih Tung is now doing. Imperial commands took him from his post; and, at the head of his armies, he put down rebellions in the northern provinces of Shantung and Shansi, and was made a full member of the Grand Council of State. In 1875 he was made Metropolitan Viceroy and moved from Wuchang to Tientsin. This position corresponds locally to the governorship of the Empire State, but nationally it is of much more importance, for the Metropolitan Viceroyalty under Li Hung Chang has assumed a first place in international diplomacy. The nation, now in despair, now in defiance, for over twenty years entrusted its knotty problems to him. The Viceroyalty of Chihli assumed greater and greater importance, although Li's predecessor was none other than Marquis Tseng. Li was created a noble of the first class, and appointed to take the initiative in foreign negotiations.

We find him displaying a profusion of talents. On one occasion he publicly worshipped a snake; on another he ordered a modern fleet. He battled with diplomats; was snubbed by the palace clique; and after China was defeated by Japan, in what was his war, was bidden to humble himself and plead for peace. The war was over in 1895, and in 1896 he attended the coronation of the Tzar, after which he made a tour of the world. Back in China again, he was degraded, then promoted, and finally seated in the Chief Grand Secretary's chair. Playing too much into the hands of Russia (for money?), he was removed from the Tsungli Yamen in 1898. A year later, 1899, Li was made Viceroy at Canton, from which post he was called to his present positions of Viceroy of Chihli and Peace Commissioner.

He has thus been ruler of the best six provinces of China, Chief Secretary of State, a sort of Prime Minister, and chief negotiator with foreign states. He first introduced a steam merchant marine as a Chinese

enterprise; steam railways began under his patronage; he worked the first coal mines, opened the first arsenal in central and northern China, bought a modern fleet, started the first Chinese cotton manufactories, and built the fortress at Port Arthur, now the base of operations for his Russian friends. Has any other living statesman, not excepting Marquis Ito, faced such an array of difficult internal and external problems, been more ardently hated, or more highly praised, than Li Hung Chang? At present he controls the peace negotiations from the Chinese side, not only in Peking, but in Washington and in London. His former private secretaries, Wu Ting Fang and Lo Fung Loh, are the Chinese ministers at these capitals. It is with Earl Li's foreign relationship that we are chiefly concerned.

His first diplomatic fencing was with Sir Frederick Bruce, the British minister at Peking — who, strangely enough, did his utmost to make Li retain an American knight errant, Burgevine by name, as head of the ever victorious army. Li insisted on dismissing Burgevine and installing General, then Major, Gordon over his army. Although Sir Frederick got the Imperial Government to support his way, Gordon was retained, and the Taipings were defeated again and again. Li formed a high appreciation of Sir Walter Medhurst, then Consul General at Shanghai, and was influenced by his judgment. But Gordon and Li fell out over the latter's treachery on the capture of Soochow, when the Wang Kings were murdered. General Gordon resigned; General Brown at Shanghai and Sir Frederick at Peking upheld him; and an appeal was made to the throne. Li here won his second diplomatic victory, securing the approval of his course in an edict which granted him unprecedented honors. Nor did he stop there. Securing Mr. Robert Hart, now Sir Robert, as mediator between himself and General Gordon, the latter was induced to return to the command of the Army, under Governor Li. In this third sparring match with a foreigner, Li came off successful.

In his fourth antagonist Li, while still Governor of Kiangsu, and with all the éclat of his success in the Taiping Rebellion, met a diplomat who was his equal. Sir Harry Parkes was not the man to be bluffed or bullied. Li had the effrontery to make fun of Sir Harry's Order of the Bath as one of "the nondescript ornaments which he himself had invented and had issued to foreigners in his employ." Though he did his utmost to escape interviews even with Sir Harry, yet the latter dogged his path, took up a post in his Yamen, gained his interview, and had his way. Li had always known how to use foreigners as his servants; but

his courtesy to Admiral Keppel at Hankow was another evidence that he had not outgrown his Oriental bigotry in dealing with high officials.

Li first represented his Government in national diplomacy after his transference in 1870 to the Metropolitan Viceroyalty. The massacre at Tientsin of the French Consul, sisters of charity, and missionaries created too large an international problem for the statesmen at the north; so Earl Li was called from Wuchang to Tientsin. M. de Rochechouart, the French Minister, said, in the settlement of the case, that however difficult the Viceroy might be to deal with, it was far easier to arrange matters with him than with the (Tsungli) Yamen.

In 1873 Li negotiated an offensive and defensive alliance with Japan, in spite of which Japan, a year later, invaded Formosa. Li was for going to war with the Sunrise Kingdom; but the Peking conservatives decided against him and paid \$300,000 to Japan as an inducement for her to withdraw. Li about this time busied himself in making a treaty with Peru.

Earl Li allowed his cupidity to lead him to another diplomatic defeat. He had not taken the measure of Sir Thomas Wade, the British Minister at Peking. Consul Margary had been foully murdered in the southwest Province of Yunnan, with the connivance of officials and soldiers. Sir Thomas did his utmost, both at Peking and at Tientsin, by peaceful means, to bring the Government to terms. At last Viceroy Li was deputed to lead in the negotiations. But with that exasperating audacity and duplicity which have often cropped out in Chinese diplomacy, the Imperial Government threw Li over, saying that it did not follow that what His Excellency Li might negotiate at Tientsin was to be given effect at Peking.

Sir Thomas, set at naught in Peking, withdrew to Shanghai. The Peking wiseacres trembled in their boots, not knowing that the British Government had sent out positive instructions that the negotiations must be conducted without recourse to force. Li was finally given "full powers," and the two negotiators met at the half-way port of Chefoo. Li dodged and parried as long as he could, then threw down his arms and negotiated with sense and skill. Sir Thomas Wade asked for more than he wanted, carried his points, and then made a voluntary concession, which greatly pleased the Chinese, although his own Government was slow to see its wisdom. Nineteen months after Sir Thomas began negotiations, the notable Chefoo Convention was signed; and a "letter of apology" from the Emperor of China to the Queen Empress of Britain was dated a month later. These negotiations resulted in no detriment to

China, but in great furtherance of foreign trade and the protection of aliens.

The Chefoo Convention was scarcely filed in the archives of the Forbidden City, when China found herself on the verge of war with Russia. Li took exactly the opposite ground from his warlike attitude against Japan in 1874, four years previously. The Peking war party was for expelling Russia from the province of Kuldja, in Thibet, which the Slavs had been holding until such time as China should be prepared to govern that province properly! Russia demanded a gift of 5,000,000 roubles and a large land concession for her voluntary occupancy of Chinese territory! The men with mediæval heads at the Celestial capital were all for trouncing Russia instead of making her the gift, as suggested. But Earl Li knew better. He stood against the whole Manchu power; came within an ace of losing his head; was ably supported by Marquis Tseng, at St. Petersburg; and staved off Russia without a land concession, by paying 9,000,000 roubles. Li's support of Russia may be dated from 1878. Since then he has never failed to remember her proximity or her power.

The modern Korean policy of China may be said to be Li's, and it has been a failure. Before entering on so important a matter, it may be noted that Li negotiated, in 1884-1886, the treaty with France which lopped off Tongking; yet it added to Li's reputation, for he triumphed over his opponents at Peking, and took the measure of M. Ernest Fournier and M. Cogodan, the French envoys.

But to return to Korea. A friendship, or, at least, a respected acquaintance, was formed between Count, now Marquis, Ito, the maker of Japan, and Earl Li, in the year 1885, when a joint treaty was drawn up, by these two worthies, in regard to Korea. "It is hereby agreed that China shall withdraw her troops now stationed in Korea, and that Japan shall withdraw hers stationed therein for the protection of her legation." It was also agreed that the King of Korea should be responsible for order in his own kingdom; that he should employ army instructors from a third country; and that neither of the two contracting parties should send troops to Korea without due notice being given to the other.

This settled the Korean question for the time being; but it came up a decade later, when it was negotiated in much the same terms, but with infinite loss of prestige to China. In 1882, Li, having been the only Chinese Governor to invest largely in foreign arms and ships, was forced to put himself on record in regard to the future war between Japan and China, which was then spoken of in whispers. Li thus memorialized the Emperor:

"It is necessary for us to make preparations for a war with Japan, and consequently we must develop our naval armaments in order to be able to carry out this object. For some years past we have already been actively engaged on these preparations, and our best efforts have been directed toward reorganization of our navy and army. Enormous sums of money have been spent in order to enable us to display our power, and to assert our superiority over our neighbor, whenever the favorable moment for this attempt shall have arrived. . . . In one of the ancient maxims it is said, 'Nothing is so dangerous as to expose one's scheme before it is ripe.' . . . My humble opinion is, let us not lose sight of our plan of invading Japan, but let us not commit the mistake of doing this in a hurried manner. First of all our navy must be thoroughly organized before we can think of an invasion."

If your Cabinet Ministers and Viceroys will agree together, and your Majesty will rule over them all, in conformity with your august decisions, then the invasion of Japan can be thought of; but it is decidedly better not to place the responsibility of this enterprise on my shoulders alone."

The foolishness of such dreams of conquest ought to have been apparent to Viceroy Li. Perhaps they were; but he was in the difficult position of trying to fight off France, satisfy the Japanophobes at Peking, and justify the vast expenditure for war implements which he was making. But in 1894 the Chinese broke the treaty with Japan of 1884 by landing troops in Korea without notice. The rag-tag armies were annihilated; Li's own troops were defeated; his fleets at the Yalu and at Wei Hai Wei were sunk; and his fortress of Port Arthur was taken by assault. Thus did Li Hung Chang invade Japan. A year later, this veteran of seventy-two summers was forced to visit Japan to sign a humiliating peace after a humiliating fuddle of a war.

Again Marquis Ito and Earl Li were supreme in the negotiations; and the treaty that resulted was the most humiliating among sovereign powers since the Germans withdrew from Paris in 1871. Li, of course, was in the dust. Where else could he be? But, however that may be, he was soon to change sackcloth for embroidered silk. Li encouraged such diplomatic manoeuvres as Japan underwent with Germany, Russia, and France, as a result of which she was obliged to relinquish the territory in Manchuria and Shantung which China had made over to her. Li was again in the ascendant. But he was outreached, or sold out; in any case he went down the scale again. He saw Russia and England slip into the place Japan vacated, and Germany occupy a well-located domicile. Li's Korean policy may have been a very good thing for himself, but as diplomacy it was a fizzle. He lost Korea, Liaotung, and Port Arthur, Wei Hai Wei and Kiaochow, Formosa and \$133,000,000 of his country's money.

The race of this fallen statesman was not yet run. He was *persona grata* at the Tzar's coronation in 1896, and undertook a sort of trium-

phant tour around the world — General Grant style. There was a notable difference, however: General Grant was victor, Earl Li was a vanquished hero. On his return he was kicked and cuffed about by the palace clique to compensate them for his foreign-gotten honors. Then he went back as Grand Councillor, and member of the Tsungli Yamen, better called the Board for Befooling Foreign Statesmen. But in 1898 he was removed from the Yamen. Sir Claude MacDonald explained this action in a dispatch to Lord Salisbury in the following words: "He has recently shown himself markedly antagonistic to our interests."

People said that this was the last of Earl Li. But those who ventured so sanguine an opinion were chiefly newcomers on the Asiatic stage of action. Within fifteen months Li went to the rich Viceroyalty of Liang Kwang. He quietly withdrew from the northern storm centre. The Manchu Mandarins called the tornado about their heads; and now Li has been sent for, to gather up and preserve the remains.

Li is now in his seventy-eighth year; and, seated in the Council Chamber at Peking, he studies the faces of the younger statesmen opposite him. China thinks she has no other statesman upon whom to place the first responsibility; and, though Britain would have none of him, there he is as Chief Peace Commissioner. He is the most unique living Oriental personage — the most trusted and the most distrusted, the most liberal and the most bigoted, the most successful and the most often defeated statesman of the Chinese Empire. He has borne a greater load of government than any, but has the respect of few. Such a man is the Chinese Machiavelli, undimmed though white with age.

ROBERT E. LEWIS.

THE CAREER OF KING EDWARD VII.

THERE were popular rejoicings in England when the Prince of Wales was born, in 1841. There was wide popular gratulation when the heir to the throne married, in 1863, the charming daughter of the Danish King. There was rejoicing throughout the land, and there was a sympathetic thrill of pleasure through the Empire of the Queen, when he recovered from his serious illness in 1872. There have been great popular receptions given to the Prince in Canada, in India, indeed in every important place within the bounds of the United Kingdom, as well as in the United States. For over half a century he has, in fact, been the centre of observation, the theme of constant discussion, in the press, or the platform, in the pulpit, and in private. The light which illuminates a throne has continuously shone upon him during all these years with intensity.

If, during this period, the British nation has given much, it has also exacted much. If the people, as a whole, have rejoiced with the Prince in his rejoicings, and sorrowed with him in his sorrows, they have also awarded him the sternest criticism — sometimes with that undue severity which is fairly characteristic of British prejudices and British convictions when once fairly aroused. But, as a rule, the people of the United Kingdom understood the responsibilities and limitations of the Prince's position. They knew the burdens he had to bear in acting upon multitudinous occasions as the representative of his royal mother. They appreciated the importance of his duties as leader of society and the nature of his success as a leader in British sports. They knew his skill as a public and after-dinner speaker, and realized something of his wonderful tact and distinct diplomatic achievements at home and abroad.

No heir to royal power in Great Britain or elsewhere has ever had such beneficial and bright surroundings as those which blessed the early career of the Prince of Wales. Reared amid the domestic life of a home which has ever since been a pattern to the people of the realm; trained by parents who were imbued with the loftiest ideals of Christian life and morality; educated under the watchful supervision of a princely father whose knowledge was as wide as his experience was varied and valuable;

surrounded by tutors such as Charles Kingsley, and by guardians such as General Bruce; brought up amidst the advice of men like Bishop Wilberforce, Baron Stockmar, and others of high attainment and character, who were frequently consulted by the Queen — in view of all this it is apparent that everything possible was done to make him a prince among men as well as a prince in rank and position.

Every opportunity of travel was given to him. As a child he accompanied the Queen and Prince Consort to Scotland and Ireland, to the Channel Isles, and to the English Lake country. In 1857, with the Hon. F. Stanley — now Earl of Derby — he travelled through Switzerland and Germany, under the care of General Grey, Colonel Ponsonby, and his tutors. After his return he again visited Ireland, and especially the Lakes of Killarney. In 1858 he went to see his sister, the Crown Princess of Prussia, at Berlin. Early in the next year he visited Rome, and was received by the Pope with great courtesy. From thence he went to the south of Spain, saw the Alhambra, and was entertained by the King of Portugal at Lisbon. Then came education of another kind, which completed his academical course — a year at the University of Edinburgh; a period at Christ Church and Pembroke College, Oxford; and another at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1860 he made a tour of Canada and visited the United States, under the care of the Duke of Newcastle.

Then came the great misfortune of his life. The death of the Prince Consort, amid all its far-reaching consequences, had no more important one than the leaving of the young Prince without a father's guiding hand. As Harriet Martineau well said three years afterward:

“It seemed as if he, on reaching manhood, was fated to lose his best and most needed personal friends. He has lost his father, and General Bruce, his governor, and now the guardian and companion of his early travels [the Duke of Newcastle].”

Very wisely, however, and despite the distraction of a personal sorrow which was far too intense for words, the Queen at once arranged a foreign tour for him; and the young Prince was sent to the East for five months, attended by his governor, Colonel Keppel, Major Teesdale, and Dr. Minter. The Nile was visited, together with Cairo, the Pyramids, Thebes, and Karnac. Then came a month in the Holy Land, accompanied by Mr. (afterward Dean) Stanley; and this was succeeded by a visit to the Viceroy of Egypt and to the Sultan at Constantinople.

It was about this time that Laurence Oliphant met the Prince at Vienna *en route*; and, after accompanying him as far as Corfu, he made

an interesting reference to his character and attainments. Said the genial author:

"I was delighted with him, and thought he was rarely done justice to in public estimation. He is not studious, nor highly intellectual, but he is up to the average in this respect, and beyond it in so far as quickness of observation and general intelligence goes. Travelling is, therefore, the best education he could have, and I think his development will be far higher than people anticipate. Then his temper and disposition are charming. His defects are rather the inevitable consequences of his position, which never allows him any responsibility or forces him into action."

Since that time the Prince of Wales has assumed an ever-increasing load of responsibility, and has never been accused, even by his sternest critics, of inaction or of indifference to his endless routine of public duty and ceremonial. Meanwhile, also, the training of the heir-apparent in constitutional matters had not been neglected. To Prince Albert this had naturally been a congenial part of his son's education, and one which he personally supervised. Men like Canon Kingsley were employed for instruction in purely historical matters; but the practical application of these teachings lay in the wise advice, and no doubt frequent conversations, of the Prince Consort. So far back, indeed, as 1849, when the boy was only eight years old, his father asked Baron Stockmar to prepare a memorandum on the subject; and the views pronounced in the following paragraph may be fairly said to have constituted the basis of the Prince's training in this connection:

"The Prince should early be taught that thrones and social order have a stable foundation in the moral and intellectual faculties of man; that by addressing his public exertions to the cultivation of these powers in his people, and by taking their dictates as the constant guides of his own conduct, he will promote the solidity of his empire and the prosperity of his subjects. In one word, he should be taught that God, in the constitution of the mind, and in the arrangement of creation, has already legislated for men, both as individuals and as nations; that the laws of morality which He has written in their nature are foundations on which, and on which alone, their prosperity can be reared; and that the human legislator and sovereign have no higher duty than to discover and carry into execution these enactments of divine legislation."

Such were undoubtedly the constitutional principles taught to the youthful Prince; and, though not perhaps immediately applied or practised by him, they have borne the most ample fruit during the last three decades of a public life which formally opened in February, 1863, when the heir to the throne took his seat in the House of Lords amid every sort of pomp and ceremony. A month later his marriage with the Princess Alexandra was celebrated, and thus marked the introduction into his life of an influence which cannot be over-rated. The manifestation of

the popularity of his bride was begun in the words of the Poet Laureate's welcome—

“Clash, ye bells, in the merry March air;
Flash, ye cities, in rivers of fire;
Welcome her, welcome the land's desire—
Alexandra! ”—

and the feeling has since continued to a great degree in the hearts of the British people and the homes of the British Empire. The first public speech of the Prince in England was given on May 2, 1863, at the Royal Academy banquet. It has been succeeded by such multitudinous functions, speeches, and ceremonies that his personality is as familiar to the people of the United Kingdom as his name is in the literature and public prints generally of nearly a half century. In this sort of work, which included much of travel and toil of a nature not always appreciated — because not understood — the years have been spent.

Prince Albert Victor was born in January, 1864; a visit in September of that year was paid to Denmark and Sweden; a tour of Cornwall was made in the summer of 1865. In 1867 the Princess was ill with a severe attack of rheumatic fever, which left her lame and delicate for many months. During May of that year the Prince visited Napoleon III. at Paris, and helped the Queen to lay the first stone of the Royal Albert Hall at Kensington. In 1868 a visit was paid to Ireland and Wales, and a prolonged tour of Europe commenced, which included France, Germany, Austria, Denmark, and Sweden, and which was continued into Egypt, Syria, and Turkey. In May, 1869, after more than six months' absence, the royal couple reached England and were soon performing once more their many acts of ceremonial and kindly patronage. Another visit to Ireland was made in 1870, and various visits were paid from time to time to the homes of nobility and gentry in different parts of the country.

During these years the Prince of Wales had done much and seen much; but it is a question whether he had really settled down to the serious business of royal life and to the great responsibilities, but ill-defined duties, of an heir to the throne. With his thirtieth year, however, came that crucial point which meets every man at some period of his life, whether he be prince or peasant, peer or pauper, and which in this case proved the metal to be genuine and the man worthy of his high post and calling. That prolonged and memorable illness in 1872; the anxiety and loyalty of an entire nation; the devoted attendance of his royal mother, and of his wife and sister; the narrow escape from an early death and the

closing of what could not yet be termed a great career; the wonderful enthusiasm which stirred the heart of England during the Thanksgiving services in London — all these had the effect, which might have been expected, of rousing all the best instincts of his nature, and of developing the teachings of his great and good father.

Since that eventful period the ever-closer attention of the heir-apparent to his duties has been such as to win the admiration and popularity of the whole people. His devotion to wife and family and home — when it was possible to escape to Sandringham from his burdened life of ceremony and public work — has won him equal respect from all who have understood the true circumstances of the case; while his leadership of society and sport tended, upon the whole, to clarify the one and elevate the other.

Not that the Prince of Wales has ever been one of those persons who believe that they have a certain mission in life which it is their duty to force forward upon all occasions and in the teeth of all prejudices. His urbanity and tact, combined with his high position, have, however, given him the widest possible influence; and this has generally been used to frown down cant and hypocrisy, to promote generosity and cultivated tastes, to encourage a hearty and really English mode of living. He has always played cards and admired beauty — whether in woman or in art, in literature or the drama. He has enjoyed the theatre as well as the opera, the Derby and the Doncaster as well as the debates of Parliament. He has appreciated the society and friendship of Mr. Reuben Sassoon as he has the society and friendship of Lord Rosebery and Mr. Balfour. But it has all been in an open, honest, hearty manner, and with a *bonhomie* characteristic of the Prince and impossible of repression even by his life of dignified ceremonial and constant round of public work.

Criticism he has had, and will continue to receive, even in his infinitely higher position of the present. To please every one he would have had to be at once the chief of saints and the prince of sinners. But a steadily growing volume of popularity has been his; and the keener the modern searchlight upon his life, the better the people seem to have liked him and to have admired his thoroughly typical English tastes and habits. One of his great friends during an earlier period was the learned, eloquent, and popular Bishop Wilberforce, whose Diary contains many homelike sketches of the Prince at Sandringham, and of the domestic, happy life of its inmates. Writing in 1864, he speaks of a visit there, and of the Prince's dogs and horses and gardens; his simple country life, and his rides and drives and walks; the various family excursions and

picnics. In 1872 he said: "The Prince shines as a host in the midst of his family, and the Princess is charming." This long friendship was closed by the Bishop's death in 1873.

During the next two years the Prince worked hard in promoting the success of the Vienna International Exhibition, as President of the English Commission; showed his love of art by helping the Landseer Exhibition of Paintings; devoted much time to the study of manufactures and industries, and paid a State visit to Birmingham, where Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was then mayor; became President of the Royal Commission to inquire into the housing of the artisan classes, and spent much time in studying and promulgating schemes which, in some measure, he had already put into effect at Sandringham; was appointed Grand Master of the English Freemasons; and spent some time in Sheffield studying its famous steel industries. In 1875 he made a prolonged tour through India; thus bringing England into touch with the swarming millions of her Eastern Empire, and helping to transmute ignorant fealty to an invisible power into personal loyalty to a beneficent sovereignty.

Upon his return the Prince settled down to a new course of public work. Under his auspices the Norwich Hospital was rebuilt; the foundation stone of a new post-office at Glasgow laid; a training ship for boys established by the Marine Society; a statue to Prince Albert unveiled at Cambridge; the British Commission of the Paris Exhibition assiduously and successfully supervised; the Midland Counties Art Museum at Nottingham opened; also the new docks at Great Grimsby and a new harbor at Holyhead; the foundation stone laid of the Chelsea Hospital for Women; also that of the South Kensington Institute of Science and Art. These functions are selected as being merely indicative of the nature and variety of his duties. In such cases the co-operation or patronage of His Royal Highness meant thousands of pounds to each particular charity or interest, to say nothing of the inevitable donation from the Prince himself of anywhere between £50 and £200. The aid of the Prince and Princess of Wales, in fact, almost ensured success to any enterprise which they might patronize, and consequently increased the responsibility of choice and the necessity for discrimination.

With the Fisheries Exhibition of 1883 began that series of efforts to embody in practical public form the development of the resources of the British Empire which owes so much to the past work and direction of the new King. He was naturally inspired by the example of the Prince Consort in this connection, and was helped by his own preliminary experiences at Vienna and Paris. Speaking of the latter, while

laying the foundation stone of the Melbourne Exhibition in 1879, Sir George Bowen declared it to be well known that the success of the Parisian enterprise was due "in no slight degree to the personal tact and energy of the Prince of Wales." After several years' work as president, His Royal Highness opened "the Fisheries," as it was popularly called, in the presence of a distinguished gathering, and with the support of most of the members of the royal family. An extract from his speech illustrates the nature of the occasion:

"In view of the rapid increase of the population in these sea-girt kingdoms, a profound interest attaches to every industry which affects the supply of food; and in this respect the harvest of the sea is hardly less important than that of the land. I share your hope that the Exhibition now about to open may afford the means of enabling practical fishermen to acquaint themselves with the latest improvements which have been made in their craft in all parts of the world; so that without needless destruction, or avoidable waste of any kind, mankind may derive the fullest possible advantage from the bounty of the waters. I am glad that your attention has been directed to the condition of the fishing population."

By October following, the five-months' run of the Exhibition had resulted in the presence of 2,703,000 visitors, a substantial financial success, and much valuable aid to the fishing interests of the country. The Health Exhibition of 1884 owed its general plan and inauguration to the Prince of Wales, though the death of the Duke of Albany prevented his active participation in its later development. He, however, formally inaugurated the work of the international juries on June 17; and the result of the whole undertaking was an impetus to science and education, and a great aid to the public comprehension and use of health-saving appliances and methods. In the succeeding year came the Inventions Exhibition, the very name of which implies its scope and importance, and in 1886 the crowning achievement of all—the Colonial and Indian Exhibition. It was a great undertaking, and for two years it was the subject of strenuous labor and thought on the part of the Prince.

No new idea is easy of accomplishment; and to obtain the co-operation of all the various governments of the British Empire in united and harmonious work and in monetary subscription was in itself a great victory,—to say nothing of the success which followed in a financial sense, through the attendance and patronage by millions of visitors; the knowledge thus disseminated regarding the resources and products of the Empire; the communications created and promoted between all its distant portions; the increase of loyalty and unity and the furnishing of the first substantial basis for the succeeding movement toward a better and greater relationship.

It must be remembered, in this connection, that in 1885 the tide of imperial knowledge and sentiment was only beginning to rise, and that it is due to this initiatory practical action and to the hard personal work and great influence of the Prince that success eventually came to his enterprise. The Exhibition was attended by some five and a half millions of people. It promoted a correspondingly wide interest in the Colonies, and it was succeeded by the Imperial Institute, the Colonial Conference, and various trade congresses of the Empire. At St. James's Palace, on January 12, 1887, after "the Colinderies" had come and gone, the Prince, in speaking to his newly organized committee for the creation of an Imperial Institute, or permanent exhibition of the arts and industries and interests of the Empire, said :

"No less than 16,000,000 persons from all parts of the kingdom have attended the four exhibitions over which I presided, representing fisheries, public health, inventions, and the Colonies and India; and I assure you I would not have undertaken the labor attending their administration had I not felt a deep conviction that such exhibitions added to the knowledge of the people, and stimulated the industries of the country. I have on more than one occasion expressed my own views, founded upon those so often enunciated by my lamented father, that it is of the greatest importance to do everything within our power to advance the knowledge as well as the practical skill of the productive classes of the Empire."

Six months later the foundation stone of the Imperial Institute was laid by the Queen, amid most imposing ceremonies, accompanied by the presentation of an address from the Prince of Wales, as president of the Committee and the Institute, in which he stated :

"It has been our desire, in pursuance of the ideas which gave birth to the Colonial and Indian Exhibition of 1886, to combine in some harmonious form a broader and more enduring representation of your Majesty's Colonies and India, as well as the United Kingdom; and our confident hope is that this Institute may hereafter not only exhibit the material resources of the Empire, but may be an emblem of that Imperial union of purpose and action which we believe has gathered strength and reality with every year of your Majesty's reign."

The opening of the magnificent building in 1893, which the Queen honored by her presence, was the occasion for another striking demonstration of imperial feeling, as well as of national regard for colonial well-being, unity, and advancement. It was followed by the Prince of Wales' statement at another function :

"We are, in fact, a vast English nation, and we should take great care not to allow those who have gone forth from among us to imagine that they have in the slightest degree ceased to belong to the same community as ourselves."

And, as evincing the sincerity of his feelings on this subject, the action of the Prince regarding a proposed testimonial to himself, in connection

with his work on behalf of the Colonial and Indian Exhibition, should be recorded here. The Earl of Cadogan had assumed the chairmanship of a large and influential committee for this purpose, and money was freely coming in, when a letter was received from His Royal Highness declining, with every possible appreciation, to accept anything of the kind, but suggesting that what had already been contributed might go to the funds of the Imperial Institute. Of course, his suggestion was at once adopted.

Meanwhile, other interests had not been neglected; and the Prince, during these years, found a constantly increasing burden of duties—a burden which he always accepted cheerfully, and which he carried with a degree of tact, and apparent, if not real, pleasure, that brought him a popular regard as warm and sincere as the affection long since won by the charming courtesy and graceful, kindly deeds of the Princess. Charity and benevolent institutions of all sorts—asylums and homes and refuges for the blind or convalescent; hospitals and deaf and dumb institutions; educational, intellectual, and literary undertakings; arts and crafts and all kinds of industrial interests; orphanages, commemorations, and women's agencies or institutions; religious, moral, and social organizations; volunteer and rifle associations, or naval and military organizations—all came under the influence of a judicious and careful patronage and royal support. In a volume dealing with this subject, fifty closely printed pages have recorded the known donations of the Prince and Princess of Wales to charitable or otherwise useful associations, covering an expenditure of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Amid his innumerable engagements and interests, the Prince was always the same in manner and style of bearing, combining with rare skill the dignity of a prince with the jovial manner of a popular English gentleman. A martinet in discipline and etiquette, and a master in ceremonial and heraldry and all the pageantry of a court, he yet ruled his realm of society and royal functions with a strong but pleasant manner, which, while strengthening his personal popularity, fully maintained the dignity and high traditions of his environment.

At Marlborough House he was the central figure in a great world of society, art, science and literature—which, in all its variations, received a share of support and attention—and of an inner circle of personal friends which included Lord Carrington, the one-time Governor of Victoria, Sir Frederick Johnstone, the Marquis of Londonderry, late Viceroy of Ireland, Lord Rosebery, the Earl of Warwick, Mr. Christopher Sykes, the Duke of Devonshire—better known as Marquis of

Hartington — Lord Cadogan, Viceroy of Ireland, and the Duke of Abercorn, who has twice held that position.

He was to be found during a part of the year at Sandringham, surrounded by his model cottages and well-managed estate, his shorthorns and thoroughbreds. He there represented a type of those country gentlemen whom hard times and agricultural depression are now so greatly reducing in number. Between these two extremes of modern life, he was constantly travelling in order to lay corner-stones, open public buildings, inaugurate public enterprises, or preside at some one of his innumerable committees — everywhere distributing his patronage with unfailing grace and good humor. One day it was a speech at the Royal Academy of Art, or perhaps of Music; another he was heading a movement to honor the memory of the noble-hearted priest who died among the lepers; again, he was presiding at a colonial banquet or an international medical congress; addressing the Rifle Volunteers; opening a London church; inaugurating the Darwin memorial as a tribute to science; attending the consecration of Truro Cathedral; presenting new colors to an old regiment; unveiling a statue to Sir Bartle Frere; attending the West Norfolk Hunt dinner; visiting the Derby; or opening the Great Northern Hospital in London.

To understand clearly the character of King Edward, Sandringham — his country seat in Norfolk — has, however, to be seen and inspected. The lot of the laborers on the estate has been a happy one, and their welfare so carefully looked after that the cottages they live in have been all rebuilt. The neighboring village is prevented from having a public house — though the Prince established a workingman's club, where a glass of good beer can be obtained under certain restrictions, coupled with plenty of wholesome entertainment in the winter-time. The kennels, the aviary, the stud, the model farm, and the dairy — including a splendid herd of Jersey cattle — have all alike been managed with recognized ability. But it was in the home life of the place that was found the real keynote to his character. Kindness, hospitality, and thoughtfulness pervaded the great establishment; and the first-named quality controlled the entertainment of visitors as it did the treatment of domestics, and even the management of race-horses or thoroughbred cattle. All the churches on the estate have been restored at the Prince's expense, and that at Sandringham village contains many memorials to those who have gone, including the Princess Alice, the Duke of Albany, the greatly esteemed Emperor Frederick, and last, but not least, a simple marble cross to the memory of Blagg — the groom who was stricken down with typhoid

fever at the same time as the Prince — and bearing the significant words, "One was taken and the other left."

In his family relationship the Prince has for many years been all that a man should be; and the education of his sons, while not perhaps of the same ideal character as his own at the hands of the Prince Consort, has been of that hearty, simple, English character which, as the British world likes to believe, assures the reasonable possession of good morals, good common sense, and a sound English training. The daughters came under the more direct control of the Princess, and received all the advantages of her own beneficent home life and experience in Denmark, and the training necessary to enable them to fill a similar place with grace and knowledge. Prince George, the present Duke of Cornwall and York, early showed a resemblance to his father in character and hearty temperament; but Prince Eddie, as the late Duke of Clarence was called, became the pet of his mother and of the Queen, and was, during his short lifetime, the possessor of a tender and affectionate disposition, which all too surely accompanied a fatal delicacy of physique. A faithful son, a good father, and a staunch friend the new King upon the whole has been; and this may be said despite some early lapses and the easy errors of youth amid exalted surroundings and innumerable temptations.

The fact of the matter is that the life of the Prince of Wales was a practical embodiment, in his own high sphere, of the jovial, yet dignified and honorable, life of the average English gentleman. It had to be adjusted to innumerable demands upon his time and to the ceremonial etiquette of his position, but aside from that he has represented the English character and lived the English life. Hence his popularity with the English masses. Even the matters for which he has been condemned freely and criticized most harshly have not seriously detracted from this popular sentiment. Two of these occurrences are memorable — the baccarat case and the winning of the Derby. Of the former, too much has been said and written; and it is certainly not necessary here to add to the controversial reams of rampant abuse or milk-and-water defence. Those who believe all card-playing to be vicious, and any game of chance in which money is involved to be gambling, will hardly be persuaded that the now historic game of baccarat was anything but wicked, under whatever conditions or circumstances.

Those who consider games, like wine, to be good or bad, according to their use or misuse; who realize that a prince as well as a peasant must have some amusement; who are not prepared to condemn off-hand

either the race-course, the theatre, the game of cards, or the ball-room ; who understand that a private game of baccarat, in a private house, with a group of private friends, is not gambling after the Monte Carlo type, and cannot properly be termed setting a bad example to the nation ; who appreciate the very English quality of standing by a friend, and like the Prince all the better for having tried to save Gordon-Cumming from the consequences of his folly — such persons will find plenty of room for defence of the Prince, and even for considerable admiration of his manly course throughout the entire affair.

Between the religious press and the Nonconformist pulpit, which so greatly criticized the Prince in this connection, and the almost equally large sporting class — an honorable and representative one in its way — which defended him strongly, was a large and undecided portion of the people. Some played cards, but did not believe in dancing ; others went to races, but would not have "gambled" under any consideration ; others indulged in the theatre, in cards, and in the ball-room, but drew a very sharp line at the race-course. Among these people severe criticism of the Prince of Wales would be simply ignorant prejudice or hypocrisy ; and probably they were very generally indifferent to the issue. However, the storm came and went, natural reaction followed the excitement, and the public came ultimately to comprehend that while the heir to the throne did his public duties so admirably, ruled society so well, and upheld with dignity the functions of royalty amid myriad temptations to idleness or worse, he was entitled to have his private recreations, even though particular individuals did not quite approve of their nature.

So with his success in horse-racing. The winning of the Derby — the blue ribbon of the turf, as Lord Beaconsfield first called it — is the end and aim of all true British sportsmen, and a magnificent experience for any man to go through. When Lord Rosebery won it, there were many protests from those who could see no good in an event which unquestionably produces much yearly gambling and betting, but which, in itself, is the climax of the most manly and thoroughly English of all pleasures and sports. The hunting-field and the country races, developing by gradations into the national *fête* on Epsom Downs, have done much to promote English physique and health and muscle, to say nothing of the characteristics of sporting honor which have made the English race-course so famous all over the world. It had long been the ambition of the Prince of Wales to win the Derby ; and his victory in 1896 with Persimmon marked not only the greatest race in the history of the Downs, but one of the most popular events in the life of the heir-apparent.

Meanwhile, various important events had occurred. Prince Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence and Avondale, the favorite and most delicate son of the Princess, had reached man's estate, had taken part in a number of functions, and had become engaged to a charming cousin — the Princess May of Teck. All the world looked bright and the sky serene, when death suddenly stepped in, and removed him from the pleasures and burdens of a great position, one which his health might have prevented him from adequately filling. But it was none the less a great sorrow to the family, where, as in the case of the Duke of Albany with the Queen, he left a blank which it was hard to fill. With it, however, came the mournful pleasure of a world-wide sympathy, and renewed evidences of the stability of the throne and the popularity of the royal family. So pronounced, indeed, were these expressions that a formal letter of thanks was published, the Prince and Princess of Wales announcing themselves as anxious to express to Her Majesty's subjects, whether in the United Kingdom, in the Colonies, or in India, the sense of their deep gratitude for the universal feeling of sympathy manifested toward them at a time when they were overpowered by the terrible calamity which they have sustained in the loss of their beloved eldest son.

Following this came the active part taken in public affairs by Prince George, as the new heir-apparent to the throne, his creation as Duke of York, and his eventual marriage to the Princess May. Before the latter had happened, however, Princess Louise of Wales had been married to the Earl (afterward Duke) of Fife. In 1896, the Princess Maud — gay, vivacious, and popular — was wedded to Prince Charles of Denmark.

During all these years of change and work and pleasure, of restricted responsibility and unlimited duties, the Prince of Wales was steadily acquiring prestige and diplomatic influence abroad. Like the Queen, he had come to be a recognized power in international politics, although, unlike her, he had no real place in such a field. But his relationship with some sovereigns was so close, his friendship with others was so great, his tact was so admirable in matters of importance as well as in trifles, that he was able to do much good. He is known to have been exceedingly popular with the excitable and sensitive French people; he is said to have reconciled the German Emperor with his English mother, the Empress Frederick; he is stated to have acquired considerable influence over the young Czar of Russia; and he steadily developed, after considerable misrepresentation, a decided popularity in the United States.

At home the new King has made his mark as an effective, though not eloquent, public speaker. To be both an orator and a prince would

be about the most dangerous combination which could beset a modern leader. It is probable that the conjunction would not last long. The heir to the throne should be cautious in his language, and measured and dignified in style. This the Prince always was. He rarely, if ever, used a wrong word, or said too much or too little. He spoke to the point, with directness and precision, and had to deal in the course of a year with almost every conceivable variety of subject and occasion. He has been a wide reader in a sort of general way; and there are few new books of importance which are not looked over or read, and possibly discussed, at Sandringham. Mr. Chauncey M. Depew has somewhere stated his surprise at meeting there a thoughtful dignitary, filling to the brim the requirements of his exalted position — in fact, a practical as well as a theoretical student of the mighty forces which control the government of all great countries, and of their best history.

Politically, King Edward has been an observant, impartial, and non-partisan leader of the nation. No one really knows his party views, though he undoubtedly has opinions of his own, and perhaps very strong ones. His chief known principle is imperial unity; his chief practical work has been the promotion of popular knowledge and the alleviation of existing troubles among the working classes; his chief social aim seems to have been the removal of class animosities, the diffusion of good manners, and the cultivation of more rational habits than those of the day when hard drinking, intoxication, and blasphemy constituted the usual social code. His friendships have been of the most cosmopolitan order, so far as politics are concerned; and, if Lord Randolph Churchill was upon intimate terms with the Prince in days gone by, so also was Lord Rosebery. He attended the House of Lords during all important debates, but never voted upon party questions. One of the rare matters of a Parliamentary nature in which he shared was the prolonged agitation for legalizing marriage with a deceased wife's sister. Upon this subject the Prince took strong ground and even used his personal influence.

His career as Prince of Wales can be summarized as in many ways a great one; while his character and life may be regarded as typical of a large English class, and as having made him a real leader of the people rather than of any parties or classes or divisions in their midst. He learned much from his father's teaching, much from his royal mother's example, much from his wife's co-operation and noble character. He has done much for the unity of the Empire, much for charity and the poor, much for industry and the workingman, much for society and sport.

WRITERS IN THE MARCH FORUM. CONTINUED.

MR. A. MAURICE LOW was born in London, and educated in London and Austria. Has been for several years the Washington correspondent of the Boston "Globe" and the London "Chronicle," and writes the monthly article on American affairs in "The National Review."

MR. WALTER B. SCAIFE was born in 1858, at Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. Received the degree of Bachelor of Laws at the University of Michigan in 1880, and of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Vienna, Austria, in 1887. Is the author of "American Geographical History" and of "Florentine Life during the Renaissance."

MR. JACOB SCHOENHOF was born in Germany in 1839. Came to America in 1861, and was naturalized in 1868, following a commercial career up to 1885. His experience in trade and manufacturing soon brought him to recognize the antagonism of facts with the generally accepted economic views. As early as 1869 he published in German periodicals his views on the errors of economic theories. President Cleveland appointed him Consul to Tunstall, England, and gave him a commission to inquire into the state of technical education and the economy of production in Europe. Mr. Schoenhoef is the author of "Wages and Trade" (1885); "The Economy of High Wages" (1892); "History of Money and Prices" (1896), etc.

Alice Irwin Thompson received her early education in northern Indiana, and later entered the Indiana State Normal School. In 1895 returned to her profession. With the exception of two years spent in teaching stenography in a business school, her work has been exclusively with the little people. Has been an occasional contributor to periodical literature.

Mr. Felix Volkovsky was one of the chief leaders of the revolutionary party in Russia, and is now among the most distinguished of Russia's political refugees. After having been several times imprisoned during the struggle which culminated in the assassination of Alexander II, he was finally banished for life to Siberia. Here he was seen by Mr. George Kennan, during his famous journey for investigating the exile system. Shortly afterward Mr. Volkovsky made his escape, crossing Siberia eastward, and after many adventures succeeded in reaching Japan. He then crossed the Pacific, and after a brief stay in the United States and Canada settled down in London, where he became, after the death of Sergius Stepniak, the head of the Russian exile colony in London and editor of "Free Russia," the organ of the Society of Friends of Russian Freedom. Mr. Volkovsky is a poet in his own language, and has done considerable writing in English.

Mr. Henry Litchfield West, a native of New York, is one of the best-known and ablest writers on political subjects at the National capital. For a number of years he has occupied an editorial position on the Washington "Post," in charge of the Congressional and political work.

THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXI, NO. 2.

APRIL, 1901.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

**COPYRIGHT, 1900.
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.**

PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
28-34 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK

The Forum

APRIL, 1901.

THE PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE Isthmian Canal Commission.

IN view of the lack of definite information on the subject of the proposed Isthmian canal, the conflicting claims of rival routes, the vast expenditure proposed, and the importance of the subject to the people of the United States both in their internal and external relations, the appointment of the present Isthmian Canal Commission on June 10, 1899, met with general approbation. While there were then a few who felt that their knowledge of the subject was sufficient to entitle them to deal with the complicated questions presented without the necessity of further enlightenment, the public at large, including the great body of our public men, were unwilling that the United States should engage in the actual construction of an Isthmian canal until the subject had been further studied by a representative body of capable and independent experts.

The appointment of a special commission for this purpose was authorized by four sections of the River and Harbor Bill, passed at the third session of the Fifty-fifth Congress. In these sections the President was authorized to make investigation of any and all practicable routes for a canal across the Isthmus of Panama, and particularly to investigate the two routes known respectively as the "Nicaragua Route" and the "Panama Route," with a view of determining the most practicable and feasible route for such canal, together with the approximate and probable cost of constructing a canal at two or more of said routes. He was further authorized to investigate and ascertain what rights, privileges and

franchises, if any, were held and owned by any corporations, associations or individuals, and what work, if any, had been done by such corporations, associations or individuals in the construction of a canal at either or any of said routes; likewise to ascertain the cost of purchasing rights, privileges or franchises held or owned by any such parties; also the probable cost of constructing a suitable harbor at each of the termini of said canal, with the probable annual cost of maintenance of said harbors, respectively; and generally to make such full and complete investigation as to determine the most feasible and practicable route across said isthmus for a canal, together with the cost of constructing same and placing the same under the control, management, and ownership of the United States. The President was authorized for this purpose to employ any of the engineers of the United States Army, also any engineers in civil life and any other persons necessary to make such investigation, and to expend for such purposes \$1,000,000, or so much thereof as should be necessary.

The President decided that the Commission should consist of nine members, six of whom should be civil engineers of high professional standing. These places were filled by the selection of Messrs. George S. Morison, Oswald H. Ernst, Lewis M. Haupt, Alfred Noble, Peter C. Hains and William H. Burr, of whom Col. Hains and Lieut.-Col. Ernst were members of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army. The Navy was represented by Rear-Admiral John G. Walker, who was chosen by his associates to be President of the Commission. The other members were Hon. Samuel Pasco, ex-Senator from Florida, and Prof. Emory R. Johnson.

The composition of the Commission when announced was very favorably regarded; and although some uneasiness has been manifested in certain quarters at subsequent delay, nevertheless the knowledge that an unbiased and thorough report would be eventually made has prevented hasty action. On November 30, 1900, the Commission filed what it calls a "Preliminary Report," which discusses the entire subject in all its more important aspects. It states definitively the conclusions reached, although the work of collecting additional data in the field is still in progress; and the final report hereafter to be presented will contain a vast amount of additional detailed information, including surveys, maps, projects and estimates.

In prosecuting their inquiries the Commission as a body spent considerable time in personal study of the alternative routes proposed, and visited Europe, where they investigated the records and plans of the

Panama Canal Company and inspected existing ship canals at Kiel, Amsterdam and Manchester. They also organized and sent into the field thirty-one working parties; making a force of more than 200 men sent from the United States, to whom were added about 600 native laborers.

The report of the Commission on all engineering questions shows thorough study, is quite complete in its summing up of the various matters investigated, and is authoritative and convincing in the conclusions stated. In form it chiefly consists of a careful description of the Nicaragua and Panama routes, respectively, as well as of the rights, privileges and franchises outstanding respecting each. Attention was given to the study of other possible routes, which resulted in the finding of none deemed worthy of special consideration.

It seems probable that some, at least, of the members of the Commission were at first inclined to prefer the Panama Route to the Nicaragua Route, and the summing up of the comparative physical advantages of each tends to the advantage of the former. To begin with, a canal at Panama would be very much the shorter, only 44.79 miles in length as against a total length of 186.53 miles by the Nicaragua Route. In the former route there would be 7 miles of deep water at Lake Bohio, and in the latter route 17.26 miles of San Juan River and 48.74 miles of Lake Nicaragua not requiring improvement, making 66 miles in all; thus leaving in one case 37.79 miles and in the other case 120.53 miles on which construction work is required and maintenance expenses will always be demanded.

The elevation also is greater on the Nicaragua Route, the estimates calling for five locks on the Atlantic side and four locks on the Pacific side, between Lake Nicaragua and the oceans; the lake itself to be held at a summit level, from 104 to 110 feet above mean sea-level, by an enormous structure to be known as the Boca San Carlos dam. The Panama Route will require but two locks on the Atlantic side and three locks on the Pacific side to reach the maximum elevation of from 82 to 90 feet at Lake Bohio. This lake also must be protected by a heavy dam, and the Culebra cut, so-called, west of Lake Bohio, will be 7.95 miles long and 274 feet deep at the highest point. It is estimated that eight years would be required to complete the excavation of this cut, which is the measure of the time required to finish the canal by the Panama Route. By the other route ten years in the aggregate are called for: two years for preparatory work and the opening of Greytown Harbor, and eight years thereafter for the construction of the great dam, which

will be about 150 feet high at the deepest part where a rock foundation can only be reached 100 feet below low water in San Juan River.

The cost of a completed canal upon each route has been carefully estimated, the same basis of computation of each unit being used in both cases. The result arrived at is \$200,540,000 for the Nicaragua Route and \$142,342,579 for the Panama Route. In the latter case, however, much work not included in the above estimate has already been done, the value of which on the same unit basis is given as \$33,934,463. The amount which has been expended by the Panama Canal Company is much larger than the total requirements of that route would have been on the plan laid out by our Commission; the funds raised for this purpose by sale of stocks and bonds being stated as \$246,706,431.68, for which securities were issued of the par value of \$455,559,332.60. A large part of these moneys seems to have been wasted in various ways; the present Board of Directors of that company stated in 1898 that its assets then exceeded \$100,000,000 in value. From the figures above given it is evident that about \$58,000,000 could now be paid for the existing assets of the Panama Canal Company, and the work completed on the Commission's plan at the same cost as that required for a canal on the Nicaragua Route.

In all these estimates a prism is provided sufficient to enable two ships of the largest class to meet at any point; and the lock system is double throughout, "so that navigation can be maintained if one system be closed for repairs or renewals." The standard dimensions adopted provide for a depth of 35 feet and a bottom width of 150 feet. The adoption of a single-lock system for the Nicaragua Route would reduce the cost \$19,678,000, and a reduction of one-third of the bottom width of the excavated channels would effect a further reduction of \$16,949,000, being \$36,637,000 in all. Corresponding changes on the Panama Route would reduce its cost \$26,901,364. These figures are certainly worthy of serious consideration in deciding upon the construction plan.

After completion, the Panama Canal would have much less curvature than the Nicaragua Canal. The time consumed in the passage of vessels would be materially less, being estimated by the Commission at twelve hours for the Panama Route and thirty-three hours for the Nicaragua Route. The basis on which this estimate is made is not stated; and, without explanation, doubt may be felt as to whether a ship requiring twelve hours to pass through a canal 44.79 miles in length with five locks could get through a canal 186.53 miles long, having nine locks and more curvature, in thirty-three hours. Even taking into consider-

ation the longer distance of lake to be traversed, the fact remains that the excavated portion of the latter route is to be more than three times as long as the corresponding portion of the other; and the passage of a steamship between the banks of a canal must necessarily be careful and slow. In practice it will be probably found that both these figures are understated. The extra time required for the traversing of the Nicaragua Canal would make up for the longer time consumed by vessels in reaching the more southern route.

The tables given by the Commission show that the distance from San Francisco to New York would be 377 miles greater, and from San Francisco to Liverpool 380 miles greater, by the Panama than by the Nicaragua Route, or say about twenty-five hours longer for a ship sailing fifteen miles per hour in the open sea; but the former route would have 131.74 less miles of canal to pass through. It is also stated that the New Orleans distance would be 579 miles greater. But, on the other hand, all distances to points on the west coast of South America would be materially shorter by the Panama Route.

The general result of all the arguments thus far stated seems somewhat decidedly to favor the selection of the Panama Route. There are other considerations, however, which make its adoption at the present time impracticable, and which bring the Commission unanimously to a recommendation in favor of the longer and more expensive canal—a result which seems particularly unfortunate in view of the higher maintenance charges with which our successors will inevitably be burdened if the Nicaragua Canal is built. Those considerations are twofold. First, there is the unfavorable character of the concession to which the Panama Route is subject, as well as its short duration. It will expire August 16, 1966, after which time all constructed works are to become the property of the Colombian Government. The Canal Company is also forbidden to cede or mortgage its rights to any government whatsoever, and is subject to charges and interests amounting to about \$500,000 per annum, together with other obligations to Colombia.

In the second place, there is an apparent impossibility of dealing with the present Canal Company on any reasonable terms. Possibly its stock might be acquired; but a sale of a majority interest only has been suggested, to be attended with provisions for the protection of the minority in the financial management. Moreover, a condition of its charter is that all the plant and material used in the construction of the canal must be of French origin. Some of these conditions might be overcome by sale to a new company to be incorporated in the United States. It

seems, however, that the title of the French Company is complicated by rights reserved in favor of a liquidator of a former corporation which became insolvent, and which is entitled, among other things, to sixty per cent of the net income. On the whole, therefore, the complicated legal situation of the Panama Route has so greatly discouraged our Commissioners that they have settled upon the Nicaragua Route as alone practicable for this country to consider, under existing conditions, although there may be read between the lines of the report the suggestion of a possibility that the Colombian Government and the French company may hereafter modify the present situation.

It should be noted that there are no treaties now in existence with either Nicaragua or Costa Rica; also that all previous concessions relating to the Nicaragua route have lapsed, and that every thing done thereunder has been forfeited. Both these governments at the present moment are untrammeled by outstanding concessions and are free to grant to the United States such privileges as may be mutually agreed upon. The possible claims of former concessionaires are entirely ignored by the Commission; there is no danger, however, that Congress will be allowed to forget them. Says the Commission:

"In view of all the facts, and particularly in view of the difficulties of obtaining the necessary rights, privileges and franchises on the Panama route, and assuming that Nicaragua and Costa Rica recognize the value of the canal to themselves and are prepared to grant concessions on terms which are reasonable and acceptable to the United States, the Commission is of the opinion that 'the most practicable and feasible route for an Isthmian canal, to be under the control, management and ownership of the United States,' is that known as the Nicaragua Route."

Up to this point the report of the Commission rests upon solid ground. The able engineers who compose two-thirds of its membership have given definite figures and hard facts. The legal situation has been thoroughly ventilated. The things which Congress and the country desired to know are stated with precision and in a manner that forbids doubt respecting the soundness of the results arrived at.

When the Commission was organized it appointed five sub-committees, which were severally authorized to enter upon the investigation of the following subjects:

1. The Nicaragua Route.
2. The Panama Route.
3. Other possible routes.
4. The industrial, commercial and military value of an inter-oceanic canal.
5. Rights, privileges and franchises.

The fourth subject designated was outside of the law under which the Commission was created. Apparently this sub-committee was organized for the purpose of finding something for Prof. Johnson to do which might be related to his own sphere of work, as he was made its chairman. He has explained his academic position as follows: "I became a member of the faculty of the University of Pennsylvania in 1893, and since 1895 have held the position of Assistant Professor of Transportation and Commerce in that institution." He signs himself as "Chairman Committee on Value of Canal."

Three pages of the Commission's Preliminary Report to the President, beginning near the bottom of page 34, are evidently attributable to the "Committee on Value." The statistics adduced and the deductions which are made therefrom are in strong contrast with the remaining portions of the report. Instead of being convincing they are very unconvincing. They seem to have been found unsatisfactory by gentlemen who have been especially prominent in pushing this Canal project; for Senator John T. Morgan, on January 14, 1901, on behalf of the Committee on Inter-Oceanic Canals, submitted to the Senate a so-called "Additional Report," which does not purport to be the work of the Commission as a body, but consists only of replies prepared by Prof. Johnson to certain questions which had been propounded "concerning the traffic of an Isthmian Canal and of the Suez Canal, and of the industrial effects which will result from the opening of an American inter-oceanic canal."

In submitting this document Senator Morgan took occasion to say:

"The thorough researches of this acknowledged authority on commercial subjects are presented succinctly in this paper, with conclusions that are demonstrated with great force and precision. The statement of the traffic resources of the canal and its effect upon the commerce and industries of the United States removes many doubts that have embarrassed the estimates of anxious but less informed inquirers, and presents in a fair, authentic and reliable form the accurate basis of correct calculation, and proves conclusively that as an investment the Nicaragua Canal will earn a highly remunerative profit on a cost of even \$200,500,000."

The Senator is quite right as to the doubts that have embarrassed previous estimates in respect to the traffic resources of the canal, but is altogether too credulous in his statement respecting the demonstration accomplished by Prof. Johnson. While, as above shown, this subject is no part of the business of the Commission, nevertheless it is an extremely important subject to the people of the United States. Having ascertained that under present conditions the Nicaragua Route is the best, and that a canal on that route can be constructed for \$200,500,000, the country now faces the question whether such construction is worth

while as a commercial proposition. In order to substantiate the affirmative of this question much more is needed than is found in the statistics assembled by Prof. Johnson. It may be said without danger of challenge that the prevalent opinion among traffic experts has been, and is, that if the canal is finally built great disappointment will be felt respecting the volume of commerce that will use it. And while Prof. Johnson employs large figures in stating his opinions on this question, he arranges them in a way that excites query rather than confidence. The special report of Prof. Johnson is the first authoritative statement of what is claimed in behalf of the proposed waterway. It, therefore, deserves careful analysis and discussion.

The history of the Suez Canal is drawn upon for analogies. Statistics are given showing the number of vessels, the tonnage and the transit receipts of that canal for each of the twenty-nine years of its existence. The figures of the last twenty-five years are grouped by Prof. Johnson in "quinquennial periods," and the conclusion is drawn that "during twenty years the traffic increased fourfold"; the years referred to being 1874 to 1898 inclusive. But the same tables show also that during the last fourteen years the traffic has increased only fifty per cent; i.e., in 1885 the net tonnage was 6,335,753, and the transit receipts were 62,207,439 francs, while in 1899 the net tonnage had increased to 9,895,630 tons and the transit receipts to 91,318,772 francs—a rate of increase by no means startling, being in fact surprisingly low, about $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per year.

These figures include war ships, transports and government chartered vessels. The tolls are 10 francs (\$2) per passenger and 9 francs per ton on the net register of the vessels, said to be "equivalent to nearly \$2 per net register ton as measured by British or American rules." The Suez Canal is ninety-two miles in length, without locks, costing about \$102,000,000, and is in the direct route of the principal commerce of the world; namely, that between all European countries and the Orient, including India, Australia, China and Japan. It is subject to no possible railway competition, the only alternative route being around the Cape of Good Hope; and the tolls have been fixed at a point where it is cheaper to use the canal than to take the longer route through the Atlantic Ocean.

Under these favorable circumstances it seems that the total net tonnage for 1899 was 9,895,630 tons, producing a gross revenue of \$17,624,553. Prof. Johnson claims that about 7,500,000 tons of traffic "will be available" for the Isthmian Canal in 1914, and regards an esti-

mate of its traffic in 1924 of 11,250,000 tons as "conservative." These figures, at first blush, are certainly out of due proportion. A statement that the Isthmian Canal will carry one-fourth as much tonnage as the Suez Canal would have been accepted as fully ample by many conversant with the respective commercial opportunities of the two canals.

It seems, however, that the estimates presented by Prof. Johnson are what he regards as possible traffic without regard to toll. He does not say this frankly, and his omission to do so has apparently led Senator Morgan to make the curious statement above quoted, that the new canal "will earn a highly remunerative profit on a cost of even \$200,500,000." A "highly remunerative profit" should be at least four per cent on the investment. This would require \$8,020,000 net earnings after paying all expenses of maintenance and operation. The Commission have not estimated these future expenses; former estimates have allowed \$40,000 per year for working each lock, and it is readily apparent that in a country with the terrific rainfall of Nicaragua the keeping in order 120 miles of new earthworks, channels and harbors would require the constant use of the shovel and the dredge. These expenses would be continuous, whether the canal produced revenue or whether it did not. If we accept one per cent on the cost, or \$2,000,000 per annum, as a reasonable expenditure for these purposes (and four times that amount may be required), it is evident that an annual gross revenue of at least \$10,000,000 would be needed to pay four per cent interest on the cost of the structure.

What Prof. Johnson actually says on the subject of tolls is this:

Question 5. "What rate of toll per ton do you adopt in estimating the gross income of the Canal, and why do you adopt that rate?"

Answer. "In investigating the tonnage of the vessels that the existing commerce of the world would cause to pass through a canal, it was not deemed necessary to adopt a rate of toll. A careful study has, however, been made of the effect that tolls would have upon the volume of business, and the general conclusion reached is that any toll greater than \$1 per vessel ton net register would cause the greater part of the tonnage of the west coast of South America to pass through the Straits of Magellan instead of through an Isthmian Canal. This west coast of South America trade comprises under present conditions nearly one-third of the traffic available for the Isthmian waterway. A toll that would divert this commerce from the canal would doubtless yield a lower gross revenue than would a toll of \$1 per ton, besides greatly restricting the industrial and commercial advantages of an inter-oceanic waterway."

This answer is ingenious, but somewhat delphic. It begins by saying that, in his answers to the preceding questions, which will be considered below, his estimates refer to commerce that might use this route to advantage without reference to tolls. He has carefully studied the ques-

tion of tolls, however, and concludes that a toll exceeding \$1 would drive away nearly all business to and from the west coast of South America; whereupon he thinks that the greatest gross revenue would be derived by making the rate \$1, and that a higher rate would greatly restrict "the industrial and commercial advantages of an inter-oceanic waterway."

But at \$1 per ton it would require 10,000,000 tons to furnish the gross earnings necessary to produce the results stated by Senator Morgan. This is twenty-five per cent more tonnage than Prof. Johnson estimates would accrue to the canal in 1914, without reference to tolls. Notwithstanding the fact that an Isthmian canal would cost about twice the cost of the Suez Canal, would be nearly twice as long, and doubtless more than twice as expensive to maintain and operate, it is proposed to work it on the basis of one-half the Suez rate of toll. It will be noted that at the rate proposed the total transit receipts on the traffic of the Suez Canal for 1899 would have been less than \$9,000,000.

Moreover, there are other things to be considered. It is said that commerce to and from the west coast of South America constitutes nearly one-third of the traffic available, and that any toll greater than \$1 per ton would divert it to the Straits of Magellan. Of course it would; and probably a toll of \$1 per ton would do the same, at least so far as traffic between European points and Chile is concerned. A ship of 3,000 tons would have to pay \$3,000 toll, which could be saved by the passage through the Straits. It is intimated that traffic other than this South American business could stand a higher toll than \$1; but that direct statement is not made. The Suez rate of \$2 takes \$6,000 per trip out of the earnings of a 3,000-ton vessel. A basis accepted by Government officials in former estimates of this character was as follows:

"The average rate for carrying freight over ocean routes of 3,000 miles or more is usually assumed by statisticians to be a mill per mile-ton. Of this, about one-half is for shore expenses, . . . leaving one-half mill per mile-ton for moving freight through the water."

On this basis \$1 would move a ton of ocean freight 2,000 miles; and \$6,000 would move 3,000 tons of ocean freight 4,000 miles.

The manner in which the subject of sailing vessels is dealt with also calls for comment. In previous discussions respecting the canal, it has usually been assumed that it would not be used by vessels under sail. Its termini are not easy or safe for such vessels to approach, and they would have to be towed through the canal. As a practical matter, the proposed construction is for steamers only and has always been so understood. This report states that while three-fifths of the sea-going tonnage

of the United States now consists of sailing vessels, sails are being displaced by steam; and, if this movement continues, after 1914 an Isthmian canal will not be much used by sailing ships.

"Moreover, the canal will so increase the competitive advantages of the steamer as to render practically certain its general substitution in place of the sailing vessel for all lines of trade through an Isthmian waterway."

These statements seem inadequate, although they very pointedly call attention to the fact that the construction of the canal would be a severe blow to the industries employed in building and operating sailing vessels in the United States.

We are now prepared to examine the estimates of traffic that have been made by the "Chairman of the Committee on Value." In his reply to Senator Morgan he quotes what had previously been said in the preliminary report of the Commission, and then proceeds to emphasize some of the conclusions there stated.

It seems that the subject has been approached in two ways, the results of both being somewhat similar. An investigation was first made of the "exports and imports of the United States and the leading commercial nations of Europe." It was necessary to convert values and quantities into their tonnage equivalents; and, this having been done, it is stated that 3,426,752 cargo tons of the maritime commerce of the United States during the year ending June 30, 1899, "could have used the canal to advantage." No light is vouchsafed as to what "exports and imports" have been regarded as comprising this section of the "maritime commerce of the United States." We, therefore, do not know whether the aggregate figures include, among other things, transcontinental traffic between our Pacific and Atlantic seabards, or traffic between the Orient and points in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains.

If such items as those are included, it is sufficient to say that very little transcontinental traffic that now goes by rail will ever leave the railroads for the water route. The roads may have to reduce their rates but they may be relied upon to keep the business. Moreover, commerce between our Atlantic seaports and the Philippine Islands will be always as likely to go via Suez as via Nicaragua, on even terms as to tolls, the distance being practically the same and coaling and other facilities via Suez being superior. Our Atlantic seaboard traffic to and from Australia, India and points west of Manila and Hong Kong will probably continue to use the Suez route, unless the longer distance is overcome by the application of tolls materially less than those charged via Suez. The

only Oriental commerce of the United States that could use the canal to advantage on even terms is that of Atlantic coast points with China and Japan; and even as to this the advantage as to distance over the Suez route would be slight, while the transcontinental railroads have heretofore handled such business quite successfully. Our imports from those countries are chiefly tea, silks and mattings, most of which profitably enter the Pacific ports and cross the continent by rail. Steamers engaged in that trade get back-loads, such as flour from the Pacific States and packing-house products, beer, wire, etc., from this country's great central basin. There is a little export of raw cotton to Japan, none of which, however, grows at any seaport, and which, when loaded in the cars at interior points for its initial transportation, will always be as likely to go via the Pacific ports as via those nearer by. The same is true of cotton piece goods, which our Southern States hope in future to export heavily to China. Japan has plenty of cotton mills of her own, procuring the greater part of her raw material from India.

In estimating possible traffic, we cannot overlook the fact that most of the "exports and imports of the United States" originate at, or are destined to, interior points in our country. This is true, for example, of California products. Very few of these take to the ocean for carriage except grain and lumber, which will not bear transcontinental transportation by rail. It is equally true of all interior points east of the Rocky Mountains. Manufacturing points in the Mississippi Valley and in all our Central States will possibly be subject to severer competition in the Orient by manufacturers situated on the Atlantic seaboard, if the proposed waterway becomes available. Their own products will not use the canal; and all their importations of tea and other Oriental goods will continue to come via the Pacific ports. The adding together of all "imports and exports," in order to learn what might use the canal to advantage has little relation to the question of the canal's commercial value. It is a species of self-deception that suggests the attitude of an advocate rather than that of a judge.

Moreover, the question is not what traffic might have used the canal if operated without tolls, but what would have used the canal had it existed with the proposed toll of \$1 per ton, which, at two and one-half mills per ton per mile for actual cost of movement, would move freight by rail 400 miles. Knowledge of details being absent it is impossible to make the proper deductions; but the estimate of 3,426,752 cargo tons of United States freight is simply incredible. It took the Suez Canal twelve years to get up to that amount of total business from all sources.

To the figures above stated, Prof. Johnson proceeds to add the trade of Europe with the west coast of South and Central America and with British Columbia, amounting to 3,346,377 cargo tons additional; thus making 6,773,129 tons in 1899, which he regards as "available for the canal." But of this 3,346,377 tons, 2,425,932 tons were to and from Chile; leaving only 920,445 tons for the total European trade with Central America, British Columbia, Peru, Ecuador, etc. Most of this is now handled by sailing vessels, which will continue to use the Straits until driven off the ocean. When the required details are obtained, it will not be surprising to find it necessary to reduce the estimated 6,773,129 tons, "available," if free from toll, to an estimate of possibly 2,000,000 tons as an outside figure which would actually use the canal at one-half the Suez rate of tolls.

Prof. Johnson, however, is not satisfied with his own estimate of available tonnage, but calls attention to the fact that it does not include "any of the trade between Europe and the Orient, a part of which would have used the American canal had it been in existence." This peculiar remark is further elucidated in the following paragraph, where he says:

"The opening of the American Isthmian canal will accentuate the present tendency of traffic to follow round-the-world lines, and not less than one-fourth of the present traffic of Europe with Eastern countries may be expected to use this route."

What he means by this is quite mysterious. The distance via Suez would be something like 2,500 to 3,000 miles shorter than via Nicaragua; yet it is gravely asserted that one-fourth of the total Suez commerce would take the longer route by reason of the "tendency of traffic to follow round-the-world lines." It seems to be thought difficult for steamers to turn round after having gone several thousand miles in one direction. If this "tendency" exists it will certainly apply to the Nicaragua traffic as well as to the Suez traffic; both being equal in volume, according to Prof. Johnson's estimates, the results would offset each other.

Having thus estimated the possible cargo tonnage of the canal, Prof. Johnson next takes up the net register tonnage, at which he arrives by saying:

"The statistics of entrances and clearances show that the net register tonnage of the American and foreign shipping that would have passed through a canal, had it existed during the year 1898-99, was 4,582,128 tons, in addition to a part of the commerce between Europe and the Orient";

he adds one-fourth of the vessel tonnage employed in the European Oriental commerce during the calendar year 1898, being 1,154,328 tons, giving a total of 5,736,456, as "the number of tons of shipping that would

have used a canal had it been in existence in 1898-99." This amount being increased 22.55 per cent per decade for expected growth in trade "would make the figures for 1909, 7,030,027 tons, and for 1914, 7,782,-240 tons net register."

Details of the "entrances and clearances" which make up this result are not yet obtainable. It will be noted that in this computation the language used by Prof. Johnson is stronger than in the other. His cargo tons were those that "could have used the canal to advantage," while his net register tons were those "that would have passed through a canal had it existed." However, both cases refer to a canal without reference to tolls, and both are regarded as representing two independent modes of arriving at the amount of traffic "available for the canal." Prof. Johnson is careful not to make any statement in respect to the estimated traffic of the canal at \$1 per ton toll, or at any other rate of toll; so that Senator Morgan's statement respecting a "highly remunerative profit" is not related to the figures furnished. It is quite within the region of the possible that his net register tonnage includes United States Navy ships and United States Army transports "that would have passed through a canal had it existed," but which, of course, would pay no toll on a canal built by the United States Government. The Suez Canal carried in its thirteenth year 5,074,809 net register tons in 3,198 vessels. That canal has been described as connecting 250,000,000 civilized inhabitants of Western Europe with thrice that number of people east of Aden; while the Isthmian canal can be expected to take such commerce only as has one or both of its termini in ports on the American continent.

The estimates made by Prof. Johnson are valueless without the details composing them. Until these are furnished and examined it must remain doubtful whether a thorough sifting of probabilities — such, for example, as would be applied to the traffic resources of a new railroad project — would show a likelihood of transit receipts from the canal sufficient to pay its necessary operating and maintenance charges. The most sanguine promoter of a new railroad scheme in competitive territory would hardly venture to add together all possible traffic by existing land and water routes, and submit the total as his expectation of business.

The fact is that Prof. Johnson has investigated the wrong questions. Information is not required respecting the freight that might have used the canal or the shipping that could have used it, had it existed in 1899 and been free to all. What is required is information as to the tonnage that would have used it under existing competitive conditions, and subject to the imposition of a reasonable toll. The proper study of this

question does not belong to professional statisticians but to traffic experts. It can be satisfactorily approached only by taking each commodity separately, studying its cost of production and its value at the proposed market, together with all transportation questions affecting its movement.

To an ordinary observer it would seem that traffic through the canal under a toll of \$1 per ton would be substantially limited to the following routes of steamer commerce, viz. :

1. Between Atlantic and Gulf ports in the United States and Western South American and Central American ports. This traffic would be in competition with sailing vessels around the Horn.
2. Between Atlantic and Gulf ports in the United States and Japan, China, Philippine and Siberian ports. This traffic would be in competition with transcontinental rail lines through United States Pacific ports. Business to and from the United States, west of the Alleghany Mountains and north of the Gulf States, would not be included.
3. Between European ports and ports on the Pacific Ocean in Peru, Ecuador, Central America, the United States and British Columbia. This traffic would be in competition with sailing vessels by Cape Horn, and the latter part would also be in competition with Canadian and United States railways through Atlantic seaports.
4. A limited amount of coarse freight between United States Atlantic and Gulf ports and United States Pacific ports. So far as existing business is concerned this would include very little that now goes by rail. It is difficult to perceive any important new business likely to be developed upon this route. Possibly a little redwood lumber might be moved to the Atlantic seaboard States through an Isthmian canal.

In the foregoing paragraphs the word "competition" is used with reference to other transportation agencies. Competition of points of production and of markets is likewise important. Considering that aspect of the matter, Route 1 would be in competition with the products and markets of Europe, which now does most of the business. Route 2 would compete with the products of our interior States, but would not affect those States as markets for Oriental products via our Pacific gateways. Route 3 might enable Europe to do some business now handled in the United States, with which it could compete more advantageously than at present. The principal east-bound traffic would be grain, as to which the canal tolls would largely offset the saving over the present sailing-vessel route around Cape Horn. Route 4 would modify to some extent the present competitive positions of the Atlantic seaboard cities and com-

munities west of the Alleghany Mountains, respectively. The probable results of this change should be carefully studied.

Conclusions based upon possibilities, and arrived at by aggregating all tonnage available, cannot fail to be misleading. The method which has been adopted, so far as this matter has gone, has been the reverse of scientific. If the Isthmian Canal Commissioners really feel that a report upon the commercial value of the proposed canal is within the scope of their duties, it is to be hoped that before submitting their final report the Commission as a body will cause a business-like investigation to be made by experts familiar with the movement and routes of traffic, to the end that the conclusions arrived at may be based upon actualities and subjected to such deductions as are required by existing commercial and competitive conditions.

ALDACE F. WALKER.

THE ENGLISH POOR-LAW.

THE opening months of the reign of Queen Victoria witnessed the inauguration of the new system of Poor-Law administration. The last weeks of that memorable reign saw the complete abandonment of the principles laid down by the reformers of the thirties. The Poor-Law, as once understood in England, is dead; dead as Julius Cæsar. A Radical government might have been expected to perform the last rites over this venerable legacy of the Reformation; but the unexpected has happened, and new point has been given to the trite saying that "Liberal governments only mark time; they never put the left foot forward, leaving that necessary movement to their Tory successors."

During by far the greater portion of the late sovereign's occupation of the throne, the one idea of all Poor-Law guardians was the rigorous administration of the law; the great test of the necessary destitution being willingness to enter the walls of the institution known with grim humor as "the house." That the evil of poverty could be cured by making the "house" as uncomfortable as possible, by placing every obstacle in the way of out-door relief, by severe surveillance, and by the deprivation of the franchise were common beliefs, fostered, no doubt, by the study of that wonderful document which every social reformer ought to read — the Report of the Poor-Law Commissioners. They reported, and with only too much reason, that the workhouses of the kingdom were the resort of the idle and the profligate of both sexes, and that they were mere seminaries for the preparation of victims for the penal code.

With such a picture before his eyes, it is not to be wondered at that the average guardian — who, as often as not, was the product of the surplus elements of the political parties, not regarded good enough for a councillorship — made the workhouse as cheerless as the Local Government Board would allow him, where, with liberty restricted and meals just sufficient to keep body and soul together, the pauper had to content himself or clear out. The accommodation for the sick was notoriously inadequate; and though here and there, notably in the large cities, men like Mr. William Rathbone, of Liverpool, arose to point out the right

path to pursue in the joint interests of patient and taxpayer, little or no change took place in the management of workhouses or workhouse infirmaries. For years Mr. Rathbone paid out of his own pocket the cost of trained nurses for the Liverpool Workhouse, in order to convince reluctant guardians, brought up on the old lines, of the advantages of such a system, almost universal at this moment, thanks to the noble founder mentioned.

The old principles are admirably summed up in the following extract from a paper written by Mr. George Rooke, for many years chairman of the Manchester Board of Guardians, and a man of wide experience:

"Some years ago I read a paper before the Manchester Statistical Society, in which I showed that the cost of administering the English Poor-Law was twenty per cent, or one-fifth, of the total expenditure. Where that proportion was reduced the pauperism became excessive, owing to weak administration. Pauperism begets pauperism, both in the present generation and the future; and it is better every way, and more economical, to expend the rates in preventing it, than, by false economy, to encourage deception, idleness, hopeless poverty, and dependence."

The first note of the impending changes was sounded in a short speech by Mr. H. Chaplin, president of the Local Government Board, delivered in the House of Commons during the past summer, in answer to a question from the Liberal benches. Among other things, he said:

"I have been most anxious to deal with this serious question this session, but I have been unable to do so. I have prepared a new series of regulations affecting the classification of inmates in workhouses, with a view of securing separate accommodation for the aged and deserving poor."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, finding it difficult enough to get money for the South African war, was the stumbling-block in Mr. Chaplin's way. Hence the reluctant conclusion, that "this is not a fitting moment to make further demands upon him."

This speech was sent out to every board in the country, with the intimation that, although an order would not be made as yet, the following were the regulations which the right honorable gentleman had in mind, to which the guardians were asked to give their earnest attention. Since then, inquiries have been sent out asking for definite replies as to how far the guardians were meeting the wishes thus expressed. For all persons over sixty-five years of age, of good character, special provision is to be made. They are to live apart, in the workhouses, from all other inmates, with special day rooms in which they can take their meals, with separate cubicles for sleeping purposes, and with lockers for their own private knick-knacks. They are to have the privilege of sleeping longer and of retiring earlier or later, at their discretion, together with the

privilege of seeing friends from the outside more frequently than now. A select committee has gone so far as to recommend the provision of separate cottages for the reception of people of this class; and it is more than likely that this suggestion will be placed on the statute book this very year. All this means that the workhouse for old men or women is practically abolished, with all its inconveniences and the other deterrents beloved of a former generation — and by a Tory government, too!

After this, one need not be surprised to find that the circular letter of the Local Government Board has something to say on the very vexed question of outdoor relief. Though guardians had the power to give adequate relief, very few indeed availed themselves of this power, the amounts actually given being totally inadequate to keep the applicants. Many unions gave none at all, preferring to put each case to the test of entering the workhouse. It was here that the old-time guardian shone in all his glory; and if by chance he did give anything, the nimble half-crown per week was the outside limit. This part of the work is the most difficult for the conscientious administrator; for pitfalls meet him at every step. Mr. Chaplin, however, has laid it down as a cardinal principle of the new régime that "aged deserving persons should not be urged to enter the workhouse at all" — a declaration which is more than sufficient to make the past guardians of the poor turn in their graves. "Not at all" marks a complete change of front, which is more marked as we read that the Board is "afraid that too frequently such relief as is now given is not adequate in amount. It is desirous of pressing upon the guardians that such relief should, when granted, be always adequate."

To carry out a tithe of the indoor changes proposed in the way of classification would involve enormous expense; but, while recognizing this, the Board hopes that no hesitation will be felt in bringing about the suggested improvements. Imbeciles are to be removed from the workhouses, and thus one of the horrors of indoor life will be sent to the limbo of forgotten things; the sick poor in the infirmaries are to be provided with more air space, better-lighted wards, and improved ventilation. This latter idea has been long carried out by the more enlightened boards; but that it was necessary in the last months of the nineteenth century to enforce such a rule is ample evidence of the backwardness of only too many local authorities.

Last December the authorities at Whitehall issued an order which cannot be disregarded, commanding certain changes in the diets of ordinary workhouse inmates, to take effect on March 25 of this year. Meat dinners, usually three per week, are now increased to four, not counting

the usual weekly bacon dinner; while soups are to contain at least fifty per cent more meat or other nourishing ingredients. An extra meal per day is to be allowed the "workers"; and, to make sure, a gigantic edition of a cookery book is issued, giving the most minute particulars as to the preparation of each dish, many hundreds in number, out of which a suitable dietary table is to be prepared, subject to the consent of the London authorities. This unexpected order fell like a bombshell from the Government kopjes; and each guardian asked the other whether it was not time to clear out of parochial life and leave every thing, from workhouse tea to the erection of tuberculosis hospitals, to the stepmothers at Whitehall. The order is there, however, one more nail — the longest and strongest, in my opinion — driven into the coffin of the erstwhile Poor-Law.

The care of children has been long the study of energetic philanthropists, who, recognizing the uselessness of changing the older folks, have hoped to educate the younger generation of paupers into ways of self-reliance. Cottage homes, scattered homes, and boarding out with families have all had their advocates; and, at last, after all systems have had a fair trial, a plain intimation is given that, for the future, no children must be kept within the workhouse walls — nay, they must not be educated in large schools. Eton and Harrow may do for the scions of the House of Lords; but for the children of the State separate cottages, with plenty of land adjoining, containing not more than twenty inmates, under the care of a foster-mother, must be provided. The cost of these isolated homes consequent upon the breaking up of the large Poor-Law schools is simply staggering. The Poor-Law is dead, long live the new régime! But what does it all mean? What is its effect going to be upon the people? And who or what has brought about this departure from well-established landmarks of the century? Thereby hangs a tale!

At the general election of 1895, Mr. Chamberlain secured thousands of votes for the Unionist party by his definite promise that old-age pensions would be given by the new Unionist government. That pledge has not been fulfilled, and is not likely to be, by the present Ministry. Whether this is due to the magnitude of the problem or to the dislike of the Tory party to embark further into domestic reform, I need not now inquire; but it is evident to all interested in this matter that the new Poor-Law regulations are a practical admission that election pledges are difficult of fulfilment. It is, therefore, to the local Poor-Law Guardians that aged deserving persons must look for any amelioration of their condition. The entire cost is to fall upon the local taxpayer; or, to put it

more forcibly and more truthfully, the cost of ameliorating the lot of the aged poor is to fall on the very class from whose ranks future "deserving" persons are to be drawn.

This is the very essence of Toryism; hence, the new regulations cannot be regarded as a genuine attempt to reform the Poor-Law, but rather as one more effort to stave off the settlement of those social problems which the presence of so much poverty in the midst of plenty has created. Sir Hugh Owen, late permanent secretary to the Local Government Board, stated that in 1892 there were in England and Wales 1,372,000 persons over sixty-five years of age, and that of this number no less than 401,000 were receiving relief from the parochial authorities. Deducting the well-to-do, we have the appalling fact that two out of every five over the age mentioned are dependent upon public charity.

Another fruitful, nay, the most fruitful, source of poverty is disease. At the Poor-Law Conference in Manchester, in October, 1899, which I attended as one of the representatives of Liverpool, it was stated by one prominent medical man present that the root of the evil was the bad housing of the working classes, combined with the moral and alcoholic conditions inseparable from their present surroundings. As an illustration he quoted the positive declaration of a German savant that the rate of mortality from phthisis alone was 15 per 10,000 where the annual income was over £100 per annum, but 40 where the income was less. Reform, or rather, destroy, the Poor-Law, put a premium on poverty, but by no manner of means attempt to grapple with the evils which cause poverty, notably the evils just referred to.

There is not a member of the middle classes in England at this moment who can afford to give his children the splendid accommodation provided in our cottage homes for pauper children. They are a standing temptation to the neglectful parent to go on neglecting. A benevolent state will step in and relieve him of his parental duties at the cost of the local taxpayer, who does try to pay his way and fulfil his natural obligations. I do not object to this except in so far as it goes to show that the relaxing of the healthy restrictions of the old Poor-Law by a reactionary government is putting a premium on thriftlessness, if not idleness.

Owing to the operations of the Employers' Liability Acts, men on the shady side of forty cannot get work, especially if the hair shows signs of turning gray. It is a melancholy sight to see in our workhouses so many men willing and able to do some work, but prevented by conditions not of their making. To make the workhouse comfortable for such inmates seems at first sight humane; but if we consider the ques-

tion more closely, we see the error in the principle of relief instead of wages, which was one of the blots on the administration previous to 1834, and which enabled the unscrupulous employer to get his labor cheap, and at the public expense. Make the workhouse attractive, and not only do you remove some of the incentives to industry, but you keep back the tide of reform, hiding the very evils which make it a necessity of our social system.

There must be some reason why men cannot get work, some cause for the large death rate in our great cities. Why not face the evils instead of attempting to bury them in new dietary tables or extra "privileges" for aged people? By the very machinery of local government the greater proportion of the cost must fall upon the laborer — in my opinion *all* falls on the worker, as he is the line of least resistance — and so we go on manufacturing paupers artificially, rather than facing the difficulty. Old-age pensions, or rather, the promise of them, had the effect, according to the managers of "friendly societies," of stopping the development of such beneficent institutions. How much more so will the indiscriminate distribution of public funds demoralize the workers of the country? The extra outdoor relief ordered for the aged is now being extended, by a natural development, to other applicants, to whom the government recommendation did not apply; and, what with the cost of the new dietaries, the unfortunate taxpayer is in for a rosy time, and all in the name of humanity, when, in fact, the refusal of a Tory minister to keep his pledges is the bottom cause. I may mention that in Liverpool alone the cost of giving one extra meat dinner to the inmates will cost over £6,000 per annum; and if the other regulations are to be insisted upon, which is most likely, many hundreds of thousands of pounds must be expended. With the debt of the local bodies intrusted with administrative powers at £270,000,000, and local taxation at the high-water mark, this does not look encouraging for the purse-bearer.

The rigorous administration of the law in the early years of Queen Victoria's reign reduced enormously the numbers seeking relief. In 1858, with a population of a little over 19,000,000, the number of indoor poor was 126,500; while in 1899, with a population of 32,000,000, there were 200,000; but the number of outdoor recipients of relief had decreased from 790,000 to 514,000. The lesson of these figures has been absolutely thrown away upon His Majesty's present advisers. As the old administrators believed they could cure poverty by severity — and certainly they did weed out the ne'er-do-wells — so the new ones, with high sanction, have the grotesque idea put before them that the reverse policy

will finally drive out the evil as St. Patrick drove the snakes from Ireland. Old people are to be attracted to make application to the Guardians, and thus be deliberately pauperized. A pleasant ending, indeed, to a life's work.

I have already hinted that the Poor-Law is a stumbling-block to real reform, and that it is used, as in the proposals of Mr. Chaplin, to impede progress, under the pretence of humanity. A Lincolnshire land-owner on the side of the poor is a novelty, and his proposals are more likely to pauperize than to create a race of sturdy, self-dependent Englishmen. The fundamental trouble in the social condition of England is land monopoly. To ask a landlord government to break it up is asking too much from human nature. But there is another phase of the land problem which is universally recognized as closely allied with the Poor-Law, and which must be reformed before the poor can have a fair chance of escaping the workhouse in early life, to say nothing of the sadder days when gray hairs have appeared.

The very close relation between the sanitary condition of the people and the Poor Law was recognized long before any attempt was made by Parliament to promote the general health of the community. More than sixty years ago the Poor-Law Commissioners were instructed to inquire as to the habits and manner of living of the working classes of that day; and, as might have been expected, they found the great bulk of the dwellers in the cities and towns living under conditions ruinous to health and strength. One-tenth of the population of Manchester, and one-seventh of that of Liverpool, lived in cellars built below the street level, where the rays of the sun never penetrated, and where fresh air never entered. Strange to relate, in the last-named city, with all its wealth and commercial importance, there are about 12,000 persons living in similar cellars at this very moment. The Commissioners further reported that disease originating in, or propagated by, means of filth and damp and over-crowded dwellings prevailed generally among the working classes in all parts of the kingdom, and that, while these diseases could be abated by improved sanitary conditions, they were not removed by high wages and abundant food if sanitary conditions were absent.

No wonder that such a state of affairs produced a large proportion of the Poor-Law charges from the classes who were the sufferers; for even high wages could not buy health, and when the bread-winner was struck down by illness caused by his surroundings, or was carried off by infectious disease, his family became a burden to the rate-payers for many years to follow. It was proved by evidence given at the inquiry that

out of a total of 45,000 widows and 112,000 orphans in receipt of relief at that period, the immense majority had been so placed by preventable causes due to the neglect of sanitary arrangements. The epidemics of cholera which scourged Great Britain in the years 1832 and 1848 compelled the powers that were to examine more closely the entire subject; and it is recorded that the first cases in London and Edinburgh of the second outbreak occurred in the very same spots as those of the first.

In view of the legislation which has followed, and its beneficent results, it is worthy of notice that the pauperism of the country has declined to some extent; and I am of the opinion that no small share of the credit is due to the better sanitation which has been the rule since the forties. Sir Edwin Chadwick, C.B., estimates that 100,000 deaths due to preventable causes occur each year in England; and as by far the greater number of these are in the ranks of the working classes, we must have an enormous burden laid upon the shoulders of the rate-payers in the shape of maintenance through the medium of the Poor-Law. Dr. J. M. Rhodes, chairman of the Chorlton Union, Manchester, says that one-third of the money spent by the guardians is due to the unhealthy surroundings of the people. This fact alone shows the necessity for the Poor-Law guardians to push forward the cause of sanitary reform with all their might, as every change for the better means a reduced expenditure, to say nothing of the good done to the people themselves.

Take, for example, the masses compelled to live in unsanitary houses. Stricken with any illness, however slight, it is almost impossible for them to recover in such surroundings; and in any case a much longer time will be required to recover than if they lived under better conditions. They must, as a matter of fact, enter the workhouse hospitals, and their families must be maintained out of the rates until the time comes when they are able to resume their occupation. Ill health plays an important part in producing poverty among the working classes; and surely it were more real economy to prevent the causes, where possible, than to relieve the people when stricken down.

The death rate of Liverpool is about 23 per 1,000 for the entire city; but there are portions of the city where the rate averages 36. The thinly populated district of Toxteth, within the city boundaries, has a death rate of only 9; Walton, where the people are not crowded together, gives but 12 to the death roll; but the Scotland and Exchange parliamentary divisions, where the laboring classes dwell, show the terrible percentage of 36 per 1,000. All these people live in surroundings which have been described in the following words by the medical officer:

"There is a large amount of property which is so constructed as to be destructive to the health and life of those living in it: pent up, airless, and sunless, ruinously dilapidated, and saturated with filth, it is not surprising to find the general rate of mortality in it, from year's end to year's end, rising to 60 per 1,000."

What is the result from the Poor-Law point of view? The medical officer gives the answer by relating the fact that out of every 100 deaths in one of the divisions named, 40 take place in the parish hospital or in one of the city hospitals, all maintained out of the rates. Last year I had a return taken out at the Brownlow Hill workhouse of the children suffering from ophthalmia; and I found that ninety per cent came from unsanitary houses, the great bulk of which had been already condemned by the medical officer.

The prevention of overcrowding must be adequately secured before anything like a serious change can take place in the health of the people. It is of no avail to do as many of our municipal councils are doing, *i.e.*, to pull down unsanitary dwellings, and refuse to erect houses in their stead to afford accommodation to the unhoused. There are densely populated districts in Liverpool which, technically speaking, are not unsanitary; that is to say, the houses are not built back to back, have a certain yard space at the rear, and comply with the building regulations of the day when they were erected. Owing, however, to the clearances of unsanitary property being out of proportion to the erection of new houses, four, five, and six families now occupy houses which were formerly occupied by one or two; and it is quite a common thing to find the court houses, which are unsanitary, having two and three families instead of the one that formerly lived therein. The medical officer's returns show 17,000 sublet houses in the city. Of these, 8,000 are admittedly unsanitary, but occupied; and during the year 1898 the inspectors found no less than 1,034 rooms overcrowded, and, what is worse, 605 "indecently" overcrowded, though not with immoral intent.

How can people living therein enjoy good health, when, for the most part, they are laborers whose average earnings never exceed 15s. per week, and whose work is carried on in the open air for the greater portion of the day, exposed to all kinds of weather? Indeed, Dr. Hope reported, in speaking of those admitted to the Corporation hospitals: "Many of those for whom admission was sought were without proper lodging in their own homes. Indeed, some of these homes had actually been condemned as unfit for human habitation." In Glasgow the results of overcrowding are the same. The death rate of those living in their own houses amounts to 11 per 1,000, while those who are compelled to live

in single rooms, or even in two, are cut off at the rate of 27. Manchester tells the same sad story. In one portion of the city the death rate was over 40 per 1,000 against 15 in the less densely populated and sanitary portions of the city. At the Poor-Law Conference held in Ulverston in 1895, Sir Walter Foster declared that the ranks of pauperism were constantly being reinforced by the neglect of sanitary legislation, and that it was on the poor that death levied its heaviest rate.

Then we have the terrible scourges of zymotic diseases, which our overcrowded towns make more than possible, and the ravages of tuberculous diseases, associated as they are with dirt, bad ventilation, and unsanitary arrangements. What a fearful loss of life these cause to our country, and what a gigantic cost to the rate-payers in the maintenance of hospitals for the relief of the victims! Liverpool has spent through its corporation over £2,000,000 in providing accommodation for infectious cases; and nearly £30,000 annually for their maintenance. How much is spent by the guardians annually in the workhouse hospitals for the poor sufferers from phthisis, and for the relief of their families outside? The number of deaths, in recent years, among residents of Liverpool from this disease has averaged annually 1,186; and a close examination would reveal the terrible fact that the deaths have been for the most part among those in crowded streets.

Fresh air and sunlight, God's greatest gifts to man, will both relieve and cure; whereas fancy dietary tables, for which the poor will have to pay in the long run, are but mere triflings with a serious subject. By these agencies may be removed the sting from the bitter satire of the Scottish member of Parliament, uttered during the rejoicings of the Jubilee Year, 1897: "The Queen reigns over more subjects than any other monarch; *she also rules over more paupers.*"

THOMAS BURKE.

THE RADICAL MOVEMENT IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

AFTER the passing of the issues which were settled by the Civil War, and until the campaign of 1896, party lines in this country were drawn less and less upon opposing vital principles. Since 1896 a radical difference of policy has been apparent in the platforms of the chief contending parties. Inasmuch, however, as the Democratic party has been defeated in two national campaigns, it to-day faces the future in a condition of uncertainty. The verdict of 1900 has disposed of the free-silver issue; Mr. Bryan will not again be a candidate; and the proposition that the party return to the principles and leaders of the Cleveland régime is being systematically suggested through editorials, reviews, after-dinner speeches, and authorized interviews of many advocates. Doubtless, these utterances represent a considerable public opinion; but the student is likely to be disappointed in much of the argument offered, in that it attempts no calm, judicial relating of the recent party changes to the modern conditions of industry or to contemporary politics in our competitor nations.

We are, however, in no position to measure the significance of these changes unless we appreciate that they have come to pass in sympathy with great age tendencies, which may manifest themselves extravagantly, but which, nevertheless, are the inevitable product of the social and industrial evolution of the century, and, as such, bound to persist until their cause is removed. No other explanation is adequate. We have to deal with an unparalleled condition. In 1896 the Democratic party met in National Convention with the machinery of government in its hands, and a Democratic President in the chair of state. This President, with his advisers, had had immense facilities for influencing the personnel of the convention; and yet the latter met only to repudiate the President's leadership, to declare for radical and revolutionary principles, and to recognize leaders comparatively unknown in the party history.

To ascribe the action of the Chicago Convention to the influence of Mr. Bryan, and to say lightly, as certain campaign orators have said, that the body was virtually hypnotized by the "cross of gold" speech, is

to ignore the fact that the convention was committed to radical views before Mr. Bryan spoke upon its floor, and to magnify unduly his personality. To say, similarly, that the action of the convention was due to a merely temporary manifestation of Populism is not satisfactory: first, because of the arbitrary assumption that the manifestation is merely temporary; and, second, because it fails to state why Populism should be so mighty or Democracy so weak that the former should capture the latter. It is, however, significant that the candidate of the Democratic party in 1896, and again in 1900, was acceptable to the Populist party, and that the sympathies of the two parties have been united since the Chicago Convention. And this means that a study of the present Democratic party and its policy must give respectful attention to the development and meaning of Populism.

The Populist party was born in a period of business depression, and has been from its inception avowedly a party of discontent. It has made its appeal to those who are dissatisfied with present-day social and economic conditions, and has sought to remedy the evils complained of through the enlarged entrance of the state as a factor in matters of industry and social relations. First organized as a national party in 1891, it was the political successor of the movement known as the "Farmers' Alliance." In the following year its candidate for the Presidency received more than 1,000,000 votes; being nearly twenty per cent of the number received by the successful Democratic candidate. This vote carried four States, secured twenty-two votes in the Electoral College, and placed eight members in the House and five in the Senate. In 1896 the party became virtually merged into the Bryan Democracy and practically ceased to be an independent factor.

The Populist party is interesting as a party, not only because of its swift rise in popular support, but also as the first political movement of large importance in this country to show clearly the influence of the modern Socialistic agitation. And it is, indeed, the contention of this article that the real significance of Populism and of the Bryan democracy, as political forms in our age evolution, is to be found in their Socialistic tendencies. This is not to say that either the Democratic or the Populist party now occupies, or is likely to occupy, in every essential, the position taken by the avowedly Socialistic writers and leaders. While the people may welcome a party influenced in its practical programme by Socialistic results, they will not trust the visionary and impracticable forces which take to themselves the name of Socialists. The academic Socialism, for example, with its complete theory of an ideal

state, its materialistic conception of history, its mistaken psychology, and its intolerance of all present social conditions, involves too much that is new and untried to be approved by the popular vote. Its practical function is to persist as an agitation until that which is true in its reasoning shall impress the mass of the people. Thereafter a part at least of its programme will be taken up and exploited by one of the more conservative parties, which to this extent will show "Socialistic tendencies," although not necessarily committing itself in regard to the abstract theories of the Socialistic philosophy.

In this sense the Populist party is, and always has been, a party of Socialistic tendencies. It does not commit itself to any theory of complete Socialism; its platform contains no demand for a radically new social order; and the Socialistic party does not recognize it as expressing its ideals. Nevertheless, in its demand for government ownership of railroads, for municipal ownership of public utilities, and, in the language of the anti-trust plank of the 1900 platform, which declares that "the one remedy for the trusts is that the ownership and control be assumed and exercised by the people," the Populist party discloses itself as the propagandist of the political idea of paternalism; and if its programme were carried out, it would be as great a step toward Socialism as the Socialistic party itself would be willing to bring to pass in its inaugural control of the government. Thus, also, the free-silver Republican party, another ally of the Bryan democracy, in its last national platform declares for municipal ownership of public utilities, and demands an enlargement of the sphere of government action in respect to the control of railroads.

The Democratic party, then, in the recent campaign, and in the earlier campaign of 1896, appeared in public alliance with parties having pronounced Socialistic tendencies; and while the Democratic party does not in its national platform declare for any of these distinctively Socialistic ideas, in many of its State platforms it uses language and expresses views which show its sympathy with its allies. This is also shown in the conduct of the two late campaigns, in which for the first time in our national history the spokesmen of a principal party have made social and financial inequality the basis of many of their arguments; appealing to the jealousy of the poor toward the rich, and borrowing their manner of speech, although not their formal statement of principles, from the Socialistic agitator.

The question now arises whether this tendency is likely to persist, or whether it should be regarded as something merely temporary; and the answer will be determined not by a theory, but by a condition. If

the Socialistic propaganda impresses so many of our citizens that, measured by the standard of practical politics, it becomes desirable for a great party to support it, then the tendency will persist; otherwise it will disappear. The reason for this conclusion is found in the logical working of the two-party system. Under this system, although it may be hard to measure and define the progress of new political ideas, it is certain that so soon as a theory takes a fast hold on any considerable number of people, so as to control or tend to control their political activity, one party will be moved toward its support and the other toward its opposition. On *a priori* grounds, therefore, for the very reason that it has made its appearance, it may be argued that the tendency will persist, modified, from time to time, according to circumstances.

Further, a study of the politics of our competitor nations shows that the spirit of Socialism is universally gaining ground. So remarkable, indeed, is its progress that it is not too much to say that the most distinctive and interesting phenomenon in recent European politics is the rise and growth of the Socialistic parties. The record of this rise and growth may be shown in tabular form, although it would be possible through long and careful analysis only, to show the influence and extent of the Socialistic movement as it has modified and indirectly influenced the political programme of other parties than those which bear its name.

VOTE OF THE SOCIALISTIC PARTY IN EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.¹

| Denmark. | Austria. |
|---------------------|-------------------|
| 1872..... 815 | 1895..... 90,000 |
| 1887..... 8,408 | 1897..... 750,000 |
| 1890..... 17,282 | Belgium. |
| 1895..... 25,019 | 1894..... 884,500 |
| France. | |
| 1885..... 30,000 | 1896..... 461,000 |
| 1898..... 590,000 | 1898..... 684,824 |
| 1898..... 1,000,000 | Great Britain. |
| Germany. | |
| 1867..... 30,000 | 1895..... 55,000 |
| 1877..... 468,848 | Italy. |
| 1884..... 590,990 | 1898..... 20,000 |
| 1890..... 1,427,298 | 1896..... 90,000 |
| 1898..... 1,786,738 | 1897..... 184,496 |
| 1898..... 2,125,000 | Switzerland. |
| | 1890..... 18,500 |
| | 1896..... 86,468 |

Conditions in civilized nations in this age are so similar that from such a table we are justified in assuming that the movement shown

¹ "The Growth of Socialism," Gunton's Magazine, July, 1890. "The Progress of Socialism Since 1888," Prof. R. T. Ely, Chautauquan, October, 1890.

is not local, but universal in its character. We must expect to find in this country many affected by it; and, applying the rule already laid down for a nation divided on the two-party system, we must expect that this movement will be recognized; that one of our parties will tend to become radical and Socialistic in its tone, and the other conservative and individualistic.

Advancing now a step further, not only do the facts show that the present age views the advance of Socialistic philosophy with increasing favor, but a study of recent industrial evolution makes it plain that this favor is not bestowed as a matter of chance, but in sympathy with well-defined changes of condition in economic production and distribution, which have come to pass during the century just closed. These changes have stimulated the spirit of Socialism not only in politics, but also in the academic field of theory. The Individualistic, or British, School of Economics is to-day fighting a losing battle to maintain its authority, and must soon pass into the background of the merely historic. For nearly a century after the publication of "The Wealth of Nations," in 1776, Adam Smith and his followers held the undisputed leadership of economic thought. The people found in their fundamental doctrine of free competition, resting upon the principles of personal liberty, private property, private inheritance, and freedom of contract, the best practical plan for the general betterment of the material life.

Within a comparatively recent period the external conditions of commercial and industrial endeavor have been so far changed that many of the laws upon which is based the British economic system are no longer applicable. Adam Smith, for example, recognized the evils of a private monopoly of any life necessity; but he demonstrated that free competition would make monopoly impossible. And so long as land-carriage of goods was by means of horses and "broad-wheeled waggons"—fifty wagons, one hundred men, and four hundred horses to every two hundred tons of goods—so long, indeed, were the transportation costs and inconveniences prohibitory for land trade over great distances. Thus in each centre were developed local industries, competing healthfully with similar institutions in relatively near territory, but not desirous or capable of supplying more than a limited market. With the introduction of the modern transportation system this condition passed away. Not only has it become possible, in the case of many commodities, to supply a world market from one central point of production; but, in addition, owing to increased specialization and use of machinery, with necessary increase of capital, it has become economical to turn

out from one plant, equipped and maintained on a magnificent scale, what formerly would have been the product of a number of small establishments. Moreover, in those cases where concentration of this extreme type is not desirable, and where a distribution from independent plants is maintained, the advantages of consolidation may be realized; for the service of the express train, the telegraph, the telephone, and the post make possible combinations which would disintegrate were it not for the ease with which the managers keep in intelligent communication with each other.

These conditions, which were not even dreamed of at the beginning of the nineteenth century, are the leading factors of the industrial legacy of that century. Accordingly, we begin the twentieth century with a period of gigantic combination and consolidation in the business world. This condition by no means calls for a pessimistic conclusion, for the advantages of these great combinations are obvious. They economize production by saving waste and by transferring the burden of labor from men to machinery. They exist, moreover, as the inevitable result of our progress in invention and appliances, and characterize one stage of our advance toward the ultimate society. Even if we wished to return to a former condition we could not, except by reversing the wheels of destiny. It is idle to rail against trusts, monopolies, and combinations. We are living in the age of great things. These institutions have their warrant to live sanctioned by the divinities of steam and electricity. We cannot rid ourselves of them. If they in their power oppress us, the remedy is not in their destruction, but in their regulation and direction for the economic welfare of all.

Just at this point the logic of the Socialistic view appears; and, paradoxical as it may seem, many a moderate supporter of the new school begins his argument with the same proposition that served as a foundation to the reasoning of the old individualists. That is to say, both the old and the new theorists may agree that the ideal relation between state and industry, in any highly civilized community, is that which secures to each individual the largest opportunity to advance and to acquire a fair share of the world's material product. So long as conditions enabled free competition to maintain equal opportunity, so long the *laissez faire* doctrine maintained its authority as a rule of state. But in these days, as a result of natural causes, competition has in large part lost its efficacy as a regulator of industry; and, therefore, to the state succeeds this function. To determine the limitation of state regulation of industry is the problem of the future; and this problem will be solved prac-

tically through long experiment, and after contests variously determined, and turning upon the action and reaction of an unstable public opinion.

The weakness of Socialism as a system is most manifest not in its destructive criticism of the present society, but in the unwarranted optimism with which it supports its proposed remedies, and in its lack of psychological foundation for its new social order. Moreover, even admitting that in the future much that is dreamed of by the Socialist may be realized, yet this result will not be reached by the methods he would prescribe. If we move toward a Socialistic goal, we shall move toward it by many stages; and we shall measure each as we move, without reference to any theory of an ultimate state, or indulgence in the dream of a Utopia to be realized through political effort. It remains true that whatever is practically good in Socialism will persist. It cannot be lost, but will be put forward from time to time as conditions ripen; and the people will take each new proposition as presented, and weigh it by itself upon its merits. For example, government ownership of railroads is a proposition no more committing the state to complete Socialism than government ownership of the postal mail service; and yet it would completely socialize the railroad industry, and its accomplishment would be in reality a victory for the Socialists, as against the Individualists.

At the dawn of the new century no political question in sight appears to be of more interest to humanity or more fraught with the destinies of the world than this same question of the relation of the state to industry. Viewed from this standpoint, not only does a return of Democracy to the standard of the Cleveland régime seem improbable; but, in a broad sense, it would be undesirable. It is well to have a definite issue between our great parties; and if, as many students and statesmen believe, the evolution of society shall proceed on lines of Socialistic principles, moving as far in this direction as society after experiment and testing may decide to be good, the early dividing of the parties upon this issue is a desideratum, and not a misfortune. From the Republican standpoint, this new departure of Democracy may be viewed with complacency. The politics of the conservative party are bound to be eminently respectable and safe; while the radical party, from its very nature, will attach to itself wild theorists and impracticable visionaries, as well as to those calmer progressionists whose judgments will in the long run control it. From time to time it will find itself committed to dangerous and extravagant fallacies, as, for example, was the Democratic party in relation to the money question in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900; but it will be also the exponent of much that is good and permanent.

And when, at length, the reviewer writes the story of the struggle, recognizing how each party held in check the other, how the absurdities of radicalism were checked by conservatism, and how in turn the conservatives were stimulated and kept alert by new ideas framed on the radical side, he will yield homage in equal measure to the opposing views, lacking either one of which we could not have made progress in orderly fashion.

WILLIAM C. MAINS.

WHY NOT THREE HUNDRED MILLION PEOPLE?

WILL the United States have a population of 300,000,000 by the end of the twentieth century? Let us hope so. The nineteenth century has brought the nation from a handful of scattered and struggling people to the front rank among the great countries of the world. If it is to maintain that proud position and take its place absolutely at the head of the world's great nations, it must increase in population and productivity, and maintain its power of participation in all the affairs of the busy world, whose population by that time will be more than three billions of people. To that end our waste places must be peopled, our great natural resources developed, our power of self-support intensified, and our facilities of interchange among ourselves, and with the whole world, multiplied. For this we need people — people with sturdy muscles and active minds, with earnest hearts and purposes. The people now distributed over this splendid area of ours being of that character, why should we not have even before the end of the century the 300,000,000 active, intelligent, successful people which the United States will require to maintain its position at the head of the world's list of great nations?

It seems to me that a study of present conditions in the United States and in other parts of the world — to say nothing of a consideration of what the future may provide in intensification of products, utilization of waste material, and interchange among peoples and countries — fully justifies us in looking forward with hopefulness and confidence to the time when the population of our present territory will reach the full limit which has been predicted for the twentieth century.

We naturally reach conclusions upon subjects of this character, first, by considering present conditions and those known to us historically, and, second, by a consideration of what the future seems likely to develop before the arrival of the condition to which the study is to be applied.

The first inquiry, then, is whether present conditions in more densely populated parts of the world, if applied to the United States, would justify the assumption that our own territory is capable of supporting the population suggested.

We are accustomed to think of China, Japan, Java, and India as the most densely populated parts of the world, and to accept the present condition of their population as the measure of conditions which would prevail in our own country if a similar density of population were applied. But in all these cases the density of population is not accompanied by facilities of internal communication which make it practicable, through development and exchange of natural products and manufactures, to utilize to their fullest capacity the producing powers which nature has furnished. In China there are practically no railroads and few wagon roads. In Japan railways and transportation routes for vehicles are better developed than those of China, though not yet to be compared with those of European countries; and the effect of this better development as compared with China is shown in the generally accepted fact that, as a whole, the condition and prosperity of the people of Japan surpass those of China, despite the fact that the average density of population in Japan is greater than that of China proper, exclusive of the dependencies of Mongolia, Manchuria, Thibet, etc. In Java and Madura, where 26,000,000 people occupy an area about equal to that of the State of Alabama, which has less than 2,000,000, the population being 517 per square mile, there are but 1,200 miles of railway, with only a fair development of highways.

The density of even China, Japan, or Java, however, does not equal that of certain European countries which are now considered exceptionally prosperous, but which have ample means of communication within their own limits and with other parts of the world. Belgium had in 1897 a population of 579 per square mile, with 2,867 miles of railway, 5,743 miles of public roads, and 1,370 miles of navigable waters and canals; the area is less than that of Maryland, but the population sustained is six times as great. Netherlands in 1898 had a population of 401 per square mile, with about 1,000 miles of railway, 3,000 miles of navigable water, exclusive of canals, and 1,907 miles of canals, in an area about equal to that of Massachusetts and Connecticut combined, but a population 50 per cent greater than that of those densely populated States. England and Wales had in 1891 a population of 498 per square mile, with 15,000 miles of railway, 2,208 miles of canals, and an admirable highway system; the area being about equal to that of the State of Georgia, and the present population twelve times as great.

Porto Rico, which is looked upon as having an extremely dense population, has only about 225 inhabitants per square mile, with very little development in railways and roads; and General Roy Stone, who has

spent much time in that island since American occupation, stated, in a recent address before the American Academy of Political and Social Science, that in his opinion the island, which now sustains less than 1,000,000 inhabitants, can well support fully 5,000,000 people, since not more than one-fourth of the soil is now under cultivation. By properly developing its producing powers, and exchanging these products for food-stuffs from other parts of the world, it would probably be able to sustain more than five times its present population, or more than 1,000 per square mile. Barbadoes, one of the British West Indies, has a population of more than 1,100 per square mile, yet is looked upon as a prosperous community. The two most prosperous countries of the world, aside from the United States, are England and Germany; yet they now sustain, on a combined area less than that of Texas, a population greater than that of the entire United States and 25 times as great as that which Texas now supports.

Laying aside present conditions in individual countries, it seems not improper to consider conditions in Europe as a whole, and, by applying them to the United States, estimate the power of our country to sustain a population under conditions which now prevail in modern well-developed communities. For this study it seems proper to consider all of Europe except Norway, Sweden, and Russia, whose climatic conditions do not justify a comparison with the present territory of the United States, exclusive of Alaska. Combining the United Kingdom and the continent of Europe, exclusive of Norway, Sweden, and Russia, it may be said that the amount of waste land by reason of mountainous conditions is quite as great in proportion to area as in the United States, though the proportion of area in the United States now looked upon as unproductive by reason of arid conditions is proportionately much greater than in Europe.

Laying aside for the moment the question of the power of our arid regions to sustain a population, let us apply present conditions of population in Europe to the area of the United States and see what they would indicate as to the power of supporting, in at least a fair degree of comfort, a population such as that predicted for this country at the end of the present century. Taking the latest data of population and area as published in official and semi-official statements, and bringing these statements down to date by an application of the rate of increase in the latest years for which accurate percentages of growth can be obtained, it may be said that the present population of Europe (exclusive of Norway, Sweden, and Russia) is 269,226,000, and the area 1,328,088 square miles, giving an average density of population for the entire area under consid-

eration of 202.7 per square mile, or eight times our present average per square mile. The area of the United States, exclusive of our island territory and Alaska, is about 3,000,000 square miles; applying to this area the European density of 202.7 per square mile, we should have a population of 602,019,000, or double the 300,000,000 promised for the end of the century.

Grouping the more densely populated parts of Europe — Belgium, Netherlands, and the United Kingdom — and applying their present average population per square mile to the area of the United States, exclusive of Alaska and our island territory, the calculation would give a population for the United States of 1,084,640,000. The density of population in the State of Rhode Island, as shown by the census of 1900, is 395 per square mile; and applying this to the entire area of the United States, exclusive of Alaska and the island territory, would give a population of 1,173,150,000.

It is not assumed, in applying present conditions of population in Europe or certain parts of the United States to our entire area, that its present productivity or productive power under present conditions averages as high as that of Europe or of the more thoroughly developed parts of our own country. As already observed, the mountain area of the United States is probably no greater proportionately than that of Europe; but the area now denominated "arid," and looked upon as capable at present of sustaining a very limited population only, may prove, when properly developed, much more valuable in this particular than is at present generally considered. It is a well-known fact that most of the lands termed "arid" prove extremely productive when supplied with a sufficient quantity of water; their producing power being even greater, in many instances, per unit of area, than that of those parts now generally looked upon as our most fertile and productive regions.

It cannot be expected that all, or, indeed, any large share, of our arid territory, which is estimated as occupying about one-fifth of the area of the country, can ever be supplied with such quantity of water as is required for the successful cultivation of the class of agricultural products now supplied by the more fertile and highly favored sections. This fact, however, does not prove the incapacity of this great arid region to sustain life. It is well known that large herds of cattle and sheep are now sustained upon vast areas which a few years ago were looked upon as entirely valueless. And while it is probably true that these areas are now sustaining nearly as large an amount of animal life as they can properly support under present conditions, it may be assumed that they

would, if properly protected and managed, support an animal life far in excess of that which they are now sustaining.

In support of this assertion we have but to consider the conditions which Nature was supplying when man took possession of this area, and before he proceeded, through lack of consistent management, to decrease rather than increase its life-producing powers. When man invaded this "great American desert" half a century ago, he found it occupied by vast herds of buffalo, antelope, mountain sheep, and other fauna, which found ample subsistence on the natural flora of the country. Its grasses and other plants, though thin and at times parched, were extremely rich in life-sustaining qualities; and Nature had adapted the races of animals produced under those conditions to life with a small water supply, and had enabled them to thrive upon the natural products of this section. The destruction of the buffalo by slaughter, and of the antelope and mountain goat through the lack of water, which was carried off into wells or utilized for irrigation purposes, and the consumption of the grasses by vast herds of sheep and cattle, have practically exterminated the races of animals which Nature had produced as adapted to the peculiar conditions of that great section. With such increase in our population as should require the highest productivity in the various sections of our country, and the application of intelligent and scientific methods in the adaptation of animal and vegetable life to these comparatively non-productive areas, the latter would doubtless produce a much greater food supply, and thus sustain a much larger population, than at present.

As to the possibilities of this now comparatively unoccupied region, we may, without impropriety, apply words written thousands of years ago:

"He turneth the wilderness into a standing water, and dry ground into water-springs. And there he maketh the hungry to dwell, that they may prepare a city for habitation; and sow the fields, and plant vineyards, which may yield fruits of increase; He blesseth them also, so that they are multiplied greatly; and suffereth not their cattle to decrease."¹

Another development which has just been begun, and which may be expected to prove of great benefit in increasing the productivity of a given area, is the application to manufacture, mining, and agricultural production of the great natural supply of power now going to waste in the watercourses and along the ocean front of the country. The closing years of the century have shown to man the practicability of developing and transporting upon a simple piece of wire the tremendous power of Niagara and of the smaller waterfalls which are found in all parts of the

¹ Psalms, 107: 35-38.

country, even in those mountain and semi-arid sections which are now looked upon as in a certain degree waste area. In the past it has been impracticable to convey the material to be manufactured to the point where Nature supplies the water-power; but now that man has learned how to transport that power a score or a hundred miles, may he not in the near future learn to transport it a much greater distance, and with less loss than at present, and to apply it not alone to manufacturing and mining, but to many of those features of agriculture which now require application of animal or human power? With the facility for applying the power which Nature so lavishly furnishes, not only to manufacturing and mining but to the tilling of every foot of available soil, and supplementing this with an intelligent understanding of soils and climates, and the selection of plants and animals best suited to them, the productivity of our great area can be enormously increased.

But it is not alone in the application of advanced methods to the surface of our wonderful country that we may expect improved conditions and increased power of sustaining population. We have in the United States what may be not improperly termed a "two-story country." No other part of the developed world has such valuable supplies beneath the surface. Our iron, our copper, our coal, our petroleum, our natural gas, our phosphates, to say nothing of our gold and silver and other minerals of high values, are already known as surpassing in nearly every case those of any other country. Every year brings new developments in this search for the requirements of life and supplies of natural wealth which are produced from beneath the surface, and which, in many cases, greatly exceed in value those of the surface area in which they are located. In this work of bringing to the surface and utilizing the vast supplies which Nature has stored within the territory now known as the United States, the great supplies of natural power already referred to will be also utilized; and thus employment given to increasing numbers of people; and our facilities for supplying those articles which man in all parts of the world requires will be multiplied, and the articles so produced will be exchanged for such food and other supplies of the soil as can be more readily produced in other lands.

Experience and the necessity which will come with increased population will also teach the Americans three important lessons which they have not yet learned: (1) The utilization of lands which are now unused; (2) the utilization of products which are now considered valueless; and, (3) the more economical utilization of the articles of daily requirement.

To-day the uncultivated area of even the most thickly populated

parts of our country is very great. Ride on the trains between Washington, the capital of the nation, and New York, its greatest commercial centre, and you find yourself passing mile after mile through lands which apparently have never been disturbed by the plough, and which, with the accumulation of centuries of forest growth, could but be productive. Note the fields which you pass and you will see considerable spots uncultivated because of a lack of proper drainage, or the lack of application of those principles of economy which would come with a more dense population in other parts of the country, from which supplies are now more conveniently drawn.

As the natural and mechanical sciences develop, wood will be more and more replaced by metals and minerals. Iron and steel now perform the duties which were formerly required of wood in the construction of buildings, bridges, ocean-going vessels, railway cars, and many other things, and thus are constantly reducing the proportion of our area which must be devoted to the production of timber; our enormous supply of coal, petroleum, and natural gas is constantly reducing the demand for a retention of forest area for fuel purposes; and when electricity produced from natural water-power shall be utilized for heat the demand will be still further reduced. While the retention of a certain forest area will always be necessary by reason of its effect upon rainfall, a reduction of demand for timber through these causes would facilitate the adjustment of the timber area to meteorological requirements and the utilization for other purposes of such portion of the present timber area as would not be so required. An intelligent application of labor to soil will also increase greatly its production both in the quality and quantity of life-sustaining plants.

Besides increasing enormously the cultivable area and the power of production on a given area, there will also be a more complete utilization of the products of the soil. Cotton seed, for example, was a few years ago considered not only useless, but an actual burden to the producer of cotton; now the exportation of its products, most of which are used for food for man or animals, amounts to \$25,000,000 a year, and the total value of the product probably to more than double that sum. Sugar, a highly concentrated food, is sold to-day for less than one-half its price a few years ago; and we have learned that we may easily produce in the United States all the sugar that our present 75,000,000 or a future 300,000,000 people would require. And with this increase in its production will come its adaptation to the preservation and utilization of fruits and other products of the soil which are now wasted in immeasurable quantities.

Recent experiments justify the belief that our soil and climate will enable us to produce the rice, the wines, the tea, the silk, the fibres, the tobacco, and also most of the tropical fruits for which we now send abroad over \$100,000,000 annually, whenever American ingenuity provides such labor-saving machinery as to enable us to produce them as cheaply as they are supplied by the low-priced labor of the countries whence we now obtain them. A higher development of skill and scientific attainments will enable our manufacturers of chemicals to produce from the natural supplies of our forests and mines most of the articles of this character for which we now send abroad over \$50,000,000 annually. The recent development of the cold-storage system has shown that millions of dollars' worth of products which were formerly considered "perishable," and which, therefore, were produced in limited quantities only — and much of that production was lost — may now be preserved in their natural state indefinitely, and thus the loss from wastage and natural causes be avoided. Hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of "by-products" are now produced from that which a few years ago was permitted to go to waste; and this process of conserving human labor and utilizing the products of the soil has but just begun.

Still another lesson which the American will learn, with another century of experience and with increased density of population, is that of economy in the utilization of the articles necessary to daily life. To-day we are proverbially a recklessly extravagant people. The farmer wastes much of the product of his fields by piling it up in cribs and stacks to deteriorate through the action of the weather. The people of cities and towns, in the space which they occupy, in their methods of life, in the foods which they consume, and in the loss in the preparation of those foods, are in many cases extravagant and in many cases wasteful. The ordinary family of five which occupies its separate residence utilizes as much of space and heat and light as would serve several times that number if intelligently applied, and serve them with much greater convenience and with the expenditure of less nerve-destroying power in solving the servant problem. The housewife who buys a pound of chops or two pounds of steak at retail must necessarily pay double or treble what the keeper of a great establishment would pay if he bought the entire sheep or ox and utilized all its parts in a methodical and scientific manner; and the fire which cooks the pound or two of food would perform the same service for ten times that quantity, and so cheapen the cost and reduce the amount of labor. Improvements in the recently developed system by which food-stuffs are purchased in large quantities, and are

cooked and prepared for distribution to consumers by canning, will reduce cost and labor to the consumer. The enormous quantity of food now required to sustain the life of the 25,000,000 horses and mules which so faithfully serve our 75,000,000 people will be applied to sustaining human life or food animals when the application of electricity and other forms of motive power creates a horseless age.

But we shall not be required to produce within our own borders all the food supplies which a nation of 300,000,000 people will demand. Lying immediately south of us is a great undeveloped continent, South America; and at no great distance, as distances are now measured, is another undeveloped continent, Africa. Immediately north of us is a great area, considerable portions of which will prove productive agriculturally; and the continent of Australia, equal in size to the United States, will also greatly increase its power of food production. Upon these great areas, which a century hence will be to the densely populated United States what we now are to densely populated Europe, our country may then draw for such portion of its food supply as is inconvenient to produce at home; and in exchange we may offer the manufactures and other requirements of daily life which our unsurpassed and almost unbounded natural facilities, coupled with American ingenuity, will enable our country to supply more cheaply than any other part of the world.

With a great railway system stretching from Patagonia to Alaska, and connecting across Bering Strait with an Asiatic railway system; with wireless telegraphy enabling instantaneous communication from city to city, and telephones so developed that man may speak from continent to continent; with the art of ocean navigation much more highly developed, and perhaps the navigation of the air as completely mastered as that of the ocean is to-day, the United States, with its power to interchange its products, will be in touch with those of other lands, and its power to sustain a population of 300,000,000 — yes, even a billion — will be greater than that by which the prosperous nations of Europe sustain their present population.

The following table shows the population, area, and density of population per square mile of the densely populated countries of Europe and Asia, and the equivalent population which that density would give if applied to the United States; the population is estimated for January 1, 1901, the estimates being based upon the latest official figures. The figures of area are from the Statesman's Year-Book.

| COUNTRIES. | AREA. | POPULATION. | | EQUIVALENT POPULATION FOR THE UNITED STATES: ¹ |
|--|-----------|-------------|------------------|---|
| | | TOTAL. | PER SQUARE MILE. | |
| Belgium..... | 11,878 | 6,808,000 | 598 | 1,776,060,000 |
| Netherlands..... | 12,648 | 5,227,000 | 418 | 1,226,610,000 |
| United Kingdom..... | 120,979 | 40,930,000 | 338 | 1,008,860,000 |
| Italy..... | 110,646 | 82,045,000 | 290 | 861,800,000 |
| Germany..... | 208,830 | 55,181,000 | 264 | 784,080,000 |
| Switzerland..... | 15,976 | 3,150,000 | 198 | 588,060,000 |
| France..... | 204,092 | 88,698,000 | 190 | 564,900,000 |
| Austria-Hungary..... | 240,942 | 44,792,000 | 186 | 552,420,000 |
| Denmark..... | 15,289 | 2,408,000 | 177 | 525,690,000 |
| Portugal..... | 34,528 | 5,080,000 | 147 | 436,590,000 |
| Servia..... | 19,050 | 2,812,000 | 121 | 859,870,000 |
| Roumania..... | 48,307 | 5,800,000 | 120 | 856,400,000 |
| Greece..... | 25,014 | 2,589,000 | 101 | 299,970,000 |
| Spain..... | 197,670 | 18,619,000 | 94 | 279,180,000 |
| Turkey..... | 62,744 | 5,711,000 | 91 | 270,270,000 |
| Total of Europe*..... | 1,328,068 | 269,285,000 | 202.7 | 602,019,000 |
| Belgium, Netherlands, and United Kingdom combined..... | 145,000 | 52,960,000 | 365.2 | 1,084,640,000 |
| Europe*..... | 1,328,068 | 269,226,000 | 202.7 | 602,019,000 |
| China ² | 1,336,841 | 886,000,000 | 289.0 | 858,880,000 |
| Japan..... | 147,655 | 43,761,000 | 296.4 | 880,308,000 |
| Java and Madura..... | 50,554 | 26,125,000 | 516.8 | 1,535,000,000 |
| India..... | 1,559,603 | 820,000,000 | 205.2 | 603,282,000 |

¹ Exclusive of Alaska and island territory.² Exclusive of Sweden, Norway, and Russia.³ Exclusive of Manchuria, Mongolia, and Thibet.

O. P. AUSTIN.

NOTES ON ITALIAN POLITICS.

PUBLIC opinion in Italy and abroad is still busily speculating as to the probable influence Victor Emmanuel III will exert over the political destinies of the State, the guidance of which, under strict constitutional limitations, was thrust into his hands with such awful suddenness some months ago. Many contend that while faithfully adhering to the letter of the "Statuto," he will incline to a broader interpretation of its spirit, in so far as regards the political prerogatives of his kingly office, and that he will infuse into his relations with his Parliament and ministers more of his own personality than was the wont of his immediate predecessor. In matters political they look for a revival of the vigorous court influences exerted during the reign of his grandfather, Victor Emmanuel II, and adduce in support of this theory the alleged failure of King Humbert, by the adoption of the rôle of political self-effacement, adequately to advance the best interests of the State.

Opinions as to the course which should be taken by the young sovereign are as the traditional leaves at Vallombrosa; but on one point all thinking men are agreed, namely, the necessity and urgency of reform, economical, financial, and social, including a more equitable distribution of the burdensome taxation. Taxation, which now falls so heavily on certain classes of the population, is the cause not only of discontent, but often of serious political disturbance.

The question naturally arises as to what extent the King can be justly held amenable for the agitation that periodically seethes throughout the country, which undeniably looks to him for relief. Few stop to think how far the political influence of the Constitutional Ruler would be permitted to extend before being rudely denounced by the hysterical portion of the various factions of the anti-dynastic opposition, amid loud heralding of the dire peril threatening the guarantees of public liberties. The anti-dynastic demonstrations fomented by the advanced parties, and supported by the clericals, when the royal sanction was accorded General Pelloux's now famous "decretone," and the obstructionism was adopted in the chamber — the extreme left and constitutional

opposition making common cause in their accusations against the Crown of an attempt to tear to shreds the "Statuto," and trample upon the public liberties — are still fresh in the minds of all. These demonstrations, together with the falling off in the ministerial majority when an appeal to the country was hazarded last June, left little doubt as to the suspicion with which the measure was viewed.

How far Italian elections represent the real national sentiment is, however, a disputed point. Certain it is that the great mass of the Italian people have no taste for revolutions or political upheavals. This was conclusively demonstrated during the long struggle for national independence and unity; and it was demonstrated, moreover, at a time when the people groaned under such political and administrative abuses as have been rarely equalled in modern times. The regeneration, or rather the reconstruction, of Italy was political, not social. And therein lies one of the most difficult problems of the present crisis; for it is impossible to tell when the unregenerated forces may spring up in their might and threaten to overwhelm constituted authority.

With the death of Victor Emmanuel II the revolutionary phase of the evolution of Italian nationality was brought to a close. But unity, although accomplished geographically, was still remote from the political and social ideal cherished by the noble, simple-minded patriots, who sacrificed their all to its fulfilment. Although the sword was sheathed after 1870, the enormous personal prestige surrounding the Liberator King carried his government triumphantly through political and social complications, the nature of which must eventually cause grave embarrassment to a successor less directly and individually associated in the public mind with the great military and diplomatic achievements of national reconstruction. It has been said that the reign of Humbert comprised and marked the period of evolution from the revolutionary monarchy, at once heroic and "bourgeois," to the monarchy which, without breaking with its traditions, must be democratic — to the monarchy, in fine, whose function in a country endowed with a parliamentary system should be that of harmonizing the old ideals concerning the majesty and glory of the State with the modern social and economical conception of the institution.

Certainly no one recognized the truth of this more fully than did Humbert himself. Certainly no ruler ever blended more harmoniously in his person the democratic attributes exacted by the modern conception of the First Citizen of the State with the traditional ideal of kingly dignity. If failure there was in the attainment of the transcendental political re-

sults dreamed of by the militant — not always very practical — patriots of the revolutionary period, the blame cannot in fairness be laid on him. Nor can it be laid with absolute justice at the door of the ministries, which have succeeded one another with such frequency since 1876, when the statesmen who walked in the footsteps of Cavour gave place to the representatives of the various shades of what has been called pure democracy.

When Depretis assumed the direction of national affairs at that period, his one aim was to clinch his hold on power by means of a subtle amalgamation of the political elements constituting the chambers. To this excessive opportunism, both in the construction of his various cabinets and in his dealing with the legislative problems, every traditional ideal was made subservient, when not totally sacrificed. To this tenacity of office at any price is due the gradual, but certain, dissolution of anything worthy of the name of party, and the formation of crude political factions, hardly amounting to more than cliques, surrounding some more or less conspicuous individuality. Such ephemeral, unsubstantial combinations, having served the ends for which they were brought into being, rapidly disintegrated, leaving in their stead the parliamentary individualism from which the country suffers to-day. Hence the long series of coalition ministries, or ministries of conciliation, depending for life not on the broad, collective national issues, but on mutual concessions or combinations fomented in the lobbies of Montecitorio.

Although in Italy the politician of the baser stamp, the man who utilizes his influence to advance his sordid personal ends, is, alas, not uncommon, the percentage of individual probity is high. The leaders of parties and the statesmen who have held high office have been, with notably few exceptions, conspicuous for personal integrity and impeccability. But the possession of a political conscience is a rarity, and the conceit of "individualism" widespread and increasing.

The often negative, and at best meagre, legislative results of the last twenty years are the fruits of this national evil. The Italian, although eminently practical in his private affairs, has thus far failed to appreciate the strength of political cohesion and party discipline. As has been said, he is, politically speaking, an individualist, yet not the less a patriot, in the narrow, personal sense of the term. He has not yet succeeded in divesting himself of the abnormal suspiciousness which is the inheritance of centuries of misrule and spoliation, of sullen submission to priestly craft and political violence, combined for ages to defraud him of his natural rights and freedom. Conspiracy is still the weapon

to which he turns instinctively. As a consequence, the Government of the Free Italy of to-day has continually to reckon with conspiracies from any source.

Until 1882 the political franchise exacted an annual contribution of forty lire (about \$8) as the minimum taxation entitling a citizen to vote. Signor Crispi then reduced this amount so considerably that practically every Italian who could read and write might have a voice at the polls. This measure was energetically denounced at the time as a dangerous concession to socialism; yet, as a matter of fact, so ignorant and so addicted to inertia are the masses, where their political rights are concerned, that popular initiative in the selection of their representative — especially in the south — can hardly be said to exist. On the other hand, the obscure agents of subversive factions have not been slow to recognize the power thus within their reach, and have taken advantage of the general apathy to foist on the electors in the more ignorant districts (the towns not excluded) candidates of the most dangerous type. Nor, owing to the national tendency to individualism, are the candidates brought forward by the Government very generally to be counted upon in a political crisis.

Again, the socialist element, recruited from among the municipal cabals of the larger towns, grows in power with every election, menacing the seats of the wealthy and influential landowners and manufacturers controlling large local interests. The small egotisms, the petty personal pugnacities, the local self-seeking at the expense of national interests, and, above all, the smugly complacent individualism displayed by a majority of such representatives, have gone far in discrediting the parliamentary system in the eyes of the nation.

While we sorrowfully note the cynical scepticism which has permeated Parliament, the magistracy, and journalism, flinging its corroding spray over the most sacred national institutions, we must seek deeply if we would appreciate the cause. Two incalculably potent forces retard the true political development and social regeneration of Italy: the Past and the Vatican. What are forty years of political franchise as against fifteen centuries of degrading tyranny? Reference has been made above to the paralyzing effects of the first. While some unduly belittle, others are prone to exaggerate, the influence of the latter over the ultimate emancipation of political Italy. Already there are signs of an awakening to political as distinguished from religious duties. A few communes in the north — chiefly in Venetia — still persist in their refusal to take any part in national politics since the occupation of Rome;

but the denizens of the south gayly make "festa" at the polls before the last echo of the Mass they have just attended has died away.

The unparalleled example of disciplinary power presented by the Papacy confronts the disjointed political factions wrangling over sordid local interests, and may well serve as an object-lesson to the prevailing spirit of individualism. It is unwise to be pessimistic when dealing with Italy. We have only to glance at what Italians have accomplished, in spite of their difficulties, in order to be reassured as to what the future will bring forth, provided the old patriotic creeds be adhered to. King Humbert, "Humbert the Good," as even his enemies have styled him, although condemned, by reason of his personal scruples and interpretation of the constitutional restrictions of his office, to a negative political activity, nevertheless represented the embodiment of the patriot, in the broadest and noblest acceptation of the word. Thoroughly in touch with his people, especially with the humble and the lowly, his appreciation of the duties and responsibilities of his "trade," as he was wont to term it, was subtle and profound. But he, too, shared the suspiciousness of his countrymen, when brought in contact with the politician. He often, some say too often, entrenched himself behind the constitutional limitations of his office when brought face to face with parliamentary deadlocks.

This refusal to lend his personal influence, or to throw the weight of the prestige of his office into the scales at times when the proceeding would have been strictly in accordance with precedent, has evoked diverse criticism. There is ground, however, for the belief that Humbert retained the firm conviction that the greatest good to the greatest number lay not in the ephemeral success of contending factions led by hot-headed extremists, but in the slow and gradual evolution of the imperishable truths set forth in that same "Statuto," unswervingly upheld by three generations of his house.

It would be unsafe to build too confidently on the lasting effects of the popular outburst of devotion and dynastic sentiment which electrified all Italy on the dire news of the Monza tragedy; but the most sceptical admit that the blood shed by Bresci's bullet has cemented the ties between people and dynasty to an extent which the most sweeping legislative concessions would have been powerless to encompass. It would be equally hazardous to affirm that even the more tractable of the heterogeneous elements in Parliament will be prepared to view with complacency any wider immission in public affairs by Victor Emmanuel III. But the prediction may be ventured upon that should he see fit,

when the occasion arises, to revive constitutional prerogatives which have been allowed to fall into disuse, he will not be denied the support of a considerable number of enlightened patriots — in and outside the chambers — whether belonging to the rigidly conservative or frankly democratic ranks.

The hour is a critical one for Italy. Will the representatives in Parliament discard the selfish conceit of individualism, and, putting aside their mutual suspicions and jealousies, rally round the free and liberal institutions they themselves have chosen, at the cost of such untold suffering and glorious martyrdom? H. REMSEN WHITEHOUSE.

OUR NEGLECTED AND PROSPECTIVE INLAND WATERWAYS.

FOR three quarters of a century the mechanical world has been railroad mad. All other modes of inland transportation were neglected, if not absolutely abandoned, until within the last decade or so. With the new century, however, there is every indication that the vast outlay of capital for improvements, which it has been customary to lavish on the steam railway, will find an overflow in the construction of great inland waterways that will dwarf in magnitude and usefulness even some of our larger rivers.

While the last century belonged to the steam engine, the present seems destined to bring the steamboat as a means of transportation to an equality with the railroad train. The building of the Suez Canal merely demonstrated possibilities, while the Manchester, Kiel, and Sault Ste. Marie ship canals and the Chicago drainage canal have proved that with the possibilities of modern engineering skill and mechanical appliances, there are no insurmountable difficulties to be encountered in extending deep waterways almost indefinitely in every direction throughout any country not diversified with high mountains.

The day of the barge canal must soon pass by. That this is a recognized probability of the near future is demonstrated by the fact that the American Government has actually spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on the survey of a ship canal from Lake Erie to the ocean, while Russia contemplates a similar twenty-eight foot channel from the Baltic to the Black Sea, and will soon spend \$40,000,000 on a ship canal connecting the Black with the Caspian Sea. The completion of these waterways would allow the largest steamships afloat to load at Chicago for Central Asian ports on the Caspian or for the larger cities of innermost Russia.

Even should the Federal Government delay its project of expending a quarter of a billion dollars on the construction of a great ship canal across the Empire State, the progressive business men of the East will not remain indifferent while the West sets them example after example of

twentieth-century enterprise. In fact, Chicago's drain is already morally forcing New York State into the expenditure of \$60,000,000 for the foundation of a ship canal 400 miles long, and this must sooner or later be followed by the cutting of the Rhode Island ship canal by Massachusetts.

New England has been most neglectful of the various sections as to her waterways; but ever prodigal to ungrateful Boston, Nature has ordained that her harbor shall always remain the one farthest north in the United States which can be united with the great inland system of American waterways. Nature seems to cry aloud to man, "Thus far shalt thou go and no farther"; and, willing or not, Boston Harbor must always remain the logical head of 24,000 miles of American inland waterways. It only remains for the Bostonians to dig a twenty-four mile ditch to remove the reproach of splendid and hurtful isolation. However, New York city, long the palm into which the riches of America have dropped, must always share with Boston. It is from this palm the great American system of canals and waterways radiates like so many fingers, with Long Island Sound, a strong undirected wrist and forearm, with its great guiding sinew which should control the workings of the fingers, flapping idly in the waters of Narragansett Bay, waiting for Boston to seize and unite it with the great body of water at her gateway.

With her natural advantages Boston, instead of Chicago, should desire to make of herself the fulcrum on which the American Board of Trade must be balanced. A map of the United States showing all completed or suggested navigable waterways places Boston at the apex of a pyramid of country, intersected by connected rivers and canals, so vast in area that its base extends from southern Texas to northern Montana; and steamers and immense barges will be able to navigate from the apex to cities located in forty different States, containing more than ninety per cent of the wealth and population of America.

Perhaps, however, by following the simile of a hand and its five fingers we can best judge of the relation of Boston and New York to the waterways of America. Place your right hand palm downward on a map of the United States, with the wrist upon Boston. You will find that the thumb stretches along the Southern coast line. Already a system of canals and natural inland waterways extends from Providence, Rhode Island, almost as far south as Wilmington, North Carolina. These are being improved and deepened; and some day the force of events will compel the Government, or individual States, to make them ship channels. A regular, but broken, system of natural waterways extends from the point where the thumb bends at Hatteras to beyond the confines of Texas.

The forefinger naturally follows upon the map the course of the Virginia Canal — proposed and begun by Washington — and the Ohio River.

Pittsburg is hopeful now of connecting herself by ship canal with the lakes as well as the ocean, a plan engineers have always pronounced feasible. The middle finger of our Boston-guided hand stretches by way of the Erie Canal to the Great Lakes; while the next finger is stretching itself in the direction of Lake Superior and the great artificial waterways that must some day connect it with Lake Winnipeg, or, possibly, the upper Missouri, in which case Boston would have a direct reach to Helena, Montana, at the foothills of the Rockies. The little finger, by some straining, might be made to lie upon the Champlain Canal and Ottawa River. If any of these projects seem chimerical, how must we class the sober proposition of the projectors of the Ottawa Canal to put on a fast line of fourteen-foot draught cattle steamers between Chicago and Liverpool, or the accomplished result of the St. Lawrence canals, which pass ships from the Great Lakes laden with grain for New York and Europe?

Canada, with a population perhaps twice that of Massachusetts, has spent \$60,000,000 building canals, and anticipates spending as much more. New York State, with a population not three times that of Massachusetts, has spent almost as much as Canada on her canals, and anticipates an expenditure in the near future which will perhaps dwarf the cost of the proposed Nicaragua Canal; while, as has been stated, if the general Government provides the quarter of a billion dollars asked for, New York State will have a ship channel twenty-eight feet deep, from Buffalo to the Narrows.

Even the easy-going Southland is waking up to the importance of her waterways, and ardently desires deep inland water connection with New England. The coal of Virginia would quickly seek the inland route to New York, were the Delaware and the New Jersey canals deepened even to fourteen feet; for the necessarily powerful storm-proof barges sent to Northern ports by way of the ocean cost upward of \$75,000 each, while flat-bottomed wooden barges, with the same cargo capacity, but built for calm canal service, would cost but one-fifth that figure. Besides, the insurance on the latter would be extremely low, instead of being almost prohibitive, as at present. The ocean barges are often wrecked, and a single storm sometimes entails the loss of an entire season's profit. The question that Boston and every other American city adjacent to the great system should ask is, How quickly can we establish the needed inland waterway traffic of America? and not, How much will it cost to do so?

Sometimes we can best understand the possibilities of our own country by studying what others have accomplished. If what I have said and am about to state may appear visionary, I would refer you to much-maligned Russia. I have seen steel barges in Siberia, that travel thousands of miles into the interior of the country, carry tons of American railway material and equipment for the building of the Trans-Siberian and Manchurian railways. In fact, hundreds of miles of this latter road have been built entirely of American material, carried inland by barges to cities along the line of the railway under construction. In Russia proper the Government manages its canals and waterways in connection with its railways. They are built to feed and aid each other. All the chief rivers of Russia have been connected by canals, so that even now large freight barges and small steam craft can sail from St. Petersburg or Moscow to Archangel on the Arctic Ocean, Astrakan on the Caspian, Odessa on the Black Sea, or to the foot of the Urals. A canal is to be cut across these low hills to a branch of the Obi; so that, by following the already existing waterways across Siberia, boats may navigate continuously from St. Petersburg for more than 4,000 miles across Europe and Asia, beyond Lake Baikal, in fact to the very boundary line of China. A ship canal from Riga, on the Baltic, to Odessa, on the Black Sea, is contemplated. A ship canal connecting the Black and Caspian seas has been surveyed; and Russian engineers declare feasible the proposed plan of turning the waters of the Amu Daria back into its old bed, so that it will once more flow into the Caspian Sea, bringing in time Russia and Siberia into direct steamboat communication with central Asia and Afghanistan.

New York and many inland cities often urge the establishment of a trans-Atlantic steamship harbor at the Atlantic end of Long Island, so that the trip across the ocean may be shortened by several hours. The project fails of success, however, because the barges of coal, wheat, and other products of the North, South, and West tranship their cargoes in New York Harbor. When they can be towed direct to Boston, doubtless the trans-Atlantic record-breaking runs will be no longer from Sandy Hook, but from Boston Light to Queenstown and Southampton; for the Hub City is already aroused to the necessity of dredging out her harbor, and, it is expected, will soon have deep water there.

Great as is the traffic on our 200,000 miles of railway, it is but twice as great per ton-mile as that of our waterways, including the Great Lakes. Our railway system is all but complete; our ship canal building has just commenced; yet great barges carrying grain enough to load an entire freight train have already begun to appear in certain sec-

tions, increasing greatly the business of the railways wherever their influence is felt, as the increased traffic they create builds up section after section of country. In fact, it is hard to conceive of the value of some of our smallest waterways, even, in building up the internal commerce of the nation.

The United States annually exports to foreign countries about 21,000,000 tons of domestic merchandise, valued at more than \$1,200,000,000; but, vast as this tonnage may seem, it is less in amount than the traffic passing during eight months of every year through the Detroit River. It is far less than the tonnage borne on the waters of the Mississippi Valley; it is scarcely half the estimated tonnage of the Hudson; about twice as much as that passing through the Harlem River or Kill von Kull; and not three times that of the Monongahela, a slack-water stream flowing among the mountains of Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

Great as are the proportions to which our foreign commerce has grown, being second in volume to that of England only, it is but as a drop in the bucket when compared with the wonderful development of our river traffic, to say nothing of the commerce of our coast and that of the Great Lakes, both of which exceed in tonnage several times the amount of our foreign trade. In fact, it is estimated that the volume of our foreign exports and imports amounts to but five per cent of the total of our interstate commerce.

No other country in the world has so much wealth to exchange as ours. No other country has so neglected its waterways; and yet on our 18,000 miles of navigable rivers we carry more produce than does all Continental Europe on her 80,000 miles of perfected waterways, on the improvement of which she has spent billions. But four of our States—Nevada, Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah—and the Territory of New Mexico, are devoid of navigable streams. In these States every stream is utilized for irrigating purposes, just as in New England every available rivulet is dammed up to make mill-ponds and provide water-power, and as in New York State the rivers are deflected to become feeders to canals.

New England has ever been backward in developing her rivers as a means of transporting her products. While Fulton was running the Clermont regularly up the Hudson, in 1807, New England was building fleet clippers to outstrip any steam vessel it was then possible to construct, and it was nearly two decades later, in 1823, that the first steamboat was seen on Maine waters. By that time there were nearly one hundred steamboats plying the rivers of the Mississippi Valley, over

fifty on the Atlantic coast south of Boston, and Pittsburg was building steamers to carry her products 4,300 miles by river to the foothills of Western Montana, a distance greater than that traversed by ships sailing from New York to St. Petersburg — as far as from Seattle across the Pacific Ocean to Japan. And from 1811, when Fulton built the first steamboat to navigate the Ohio, to the present day, the larger cities on the banks of the Ohio have held their predominance as builders of river barges and steamboats; just as now the greatest steamboats and ocean steamships are built on the Delaware and on the waters of Long Island Sound, instead of in isolated Boston Harbor.

Incomplete Government reports place the annual traffic of the rivers of America at something over 110,000,000 tons. It is, however, certainly more than that figure. The total freight traffic of the Great Lakes amounts to 124,000,000 tons; but as all of this leaves one lake port to enter another, the figures are divided by two, giving the traffic on the lakes 62,000,000 tons. The river traffic, however, goes largely to, and comes from, the harbors of the sea coast, so that the same rule cannot be applied. Probably 100,000,000 tons would be a fair estimate of the tonnage of our rivers, exclusive of the coast harbors and inland waterways which are arms of the ocean. The average distance travelled by freight on the lakes is 841 miles; on the rivers probably not very much more than 150; so that the mile tonnage borne on the rivers is probably one-fourth that of the Great Lakes. The mile tonnage of the Great Lakes amounts to forty per cent of the total mile tonnage carried on the railways; that of the rivers foots up another ten per cent; so that on the inland waterways of America, exclusive of harbors, bays, and salt-water sounds, is borne fully fifty per cent of our inland commerce.

So far the Government has been as lavish in its donation to railways as it has been in its appropriations for the improvement of our rivers, with the difference that it owns the waterways and does not possess a single line of connecting railway. Almost every navigable river in America is paralleled by railway lines; yet, our rivers do not only hold their own, but for the last decade their traffic has shown a marked increase. The railroads of Long Island and southern New England, from fighting steamboat competition have taken to the water; and they find it to their interest to increase the fleet of Sound steamers, both in number and magnificence.

The Hudson River cannot be approached on either bank, from New York to Troy, without crossing one or more railroad tracks; yet the traffic on the waters of this river exceeds that of the entire system of the Mis-

sissippi Valley. The railroads have built numberless cities, and so has river traffic. Each benefits by competition with the other. It is impossible to state accurately the amount of tonnage brought down the lower Hudson by the fleets of schooners and barges plying between New York city and the brick-yards of Haverstraw and the coal termini at Newburg and other points. But the Government engineers estimate the local traffic between Coxsackie and Troy at 4,000,000 tons annually, and that of the through traffic from Albany to New York at 10,000,000 tons. These amounts possibly cover less than half the total traffic on the river, which some authorities place as high as 40,000,000 tons per annum.

The Middle States, settled by the canal-building Dutch, and the present eastern terminals of the waterway system still control fully one-half of the river traffic of America; the Hudson, Harlem, Kill von Kull, and Delaware swelling the total to an enormous figure. While fully 75,000,000 tons are moved both ways on these waters annually, the rivers of New England do not carry 5,000,000 tons, and the fresh waterways of the South, from Virginia to Alabama, carry a scant 10,000,000, or about the average increase of the Mississippi Valley for a single decade.

The six-foot deep Erie Canal, besides saving shippers from the West in the way of freight rates more than a quarter of a billion dollars in the last half century, has made New York the richest State in the Union, and yearly adds to her wealth, so that she can afford to pay all expenses for its repairs and make all traffic free. When the canal is deepened it is to the interest of Boston and Chicago, as much as to that of New York, that traffic thereon shall be rapid and unrestrained. Lockage dues and the many bridges prevent the success of the Manchester Ship Canal. In America every railway and high-road should be compelled to follow a custom I have often observed in Japan. There the roads go under the river, so that the traffic of neither is interfered with for a moment, day or night.

Dixie is at last beginning to contest for rivalry with New England. She wants to get a closer grip, and is working her way up — by water. In the South the removal of obstructions from the various river beds has tended to enlarge the fresh-water traffic; and, now that the inland sounds along the coast are being connected, a constantly increasing barge traffic is springing up. But it is in the Valley of the Mississippi that the great volume of inland traffic will continue to increase for decades to come. Already 35,000,000 people, just half our population, live in that great valley, and a constant stream of immigration is still pouring westward over the Alleghanies. The future of America belongs to that great sec-

tion. The Mississippi has forty-four navigable tributaries, in all over 16,000 miles of navigable waterways, to which the Government adds every five years, by dredging and improvements, an additional 1,000 miles. The waters of the Great Lakes now empty into the Father of Waters, as well as into the Hudson and the St. Lawrence. In time ships will pass from St. Louis to Chicago and on to New York, continuing thence to Boston, if she wills it so. But Boston is not to destroy all rivalries by digging her canal. The two billions and a half bushels of grain raised annually in the Mississippi Valley are beginning to seek more and more a Southern outlet; but, of course, no one can foretell what would be the result if by way of the Ohio River, the Pittsburg Ship Canal, and the Potomac River, or by way of the Pittsburg and Erie ship canals, this immense crop, or even a part of it, could reach the northern Atlantic coast, so much nearer the European markets than New Orleans. New Orleans and Boston may yet come into competition as rival ports.

The South Atlantic States, aroused by a prospect of their seaports being brought into river and canal communication with the Great Lakes, have had their representatives introduce in Congress numerous bills looking to the construction of a series of canalways to connect the navigable waters of the Tennessee River with those of the Alabama, Chattahoochee, and Altamaha; thus bringing Mobile, Savannah, and Charleston into open rivalry with those cities of the North which are aiming at becoming coast terminals of the great proposed inland system of waterways. In fact, in the South some work has already been actually accomplished on the proposed system of canals, and it is expected that the proposition to cut a ship canal across Florida from Jacksonville to the Suwannee River will be carried into effect as soon as the Nicaragua Canal is built.

Once the Nicaragua Canal is completed, the teeming millions of China, who have at last become acquainted with, and are learning to buy in immense quantities, our wheat flour and corn meal, will be brought much nearer to New Orleans and the South than to New York or Boston. Asia is the market of the future for American products; and at the mouth of the Mississippi will gather the thousands of barges and steam-boats that bring down the produce from an area as vast as that of the Valley of the Yangtse Kiang, and more fertile by far. As the trade of America with Asia grows, with the completion of the Nicaragua Canal, it will be diverted westward. Nor is this all that need be feared by the East, for, as the Nicaragua Canal will open up new opportunities for the South and West, the completion of the improvements in the Nelson

River, contemplated by the Canadian Government, will tend to divert the products of the northern Lake region toward that outlet.

Long Island Sound and Duluth are already connected by inland waterways which must in time be extended a few miles farther to the Red River of the North and Lake Winnipeg. From Winnipeg to Hudson Bay is less than 700 miles; the Nelson River, a magnificent waterway, extends the entire distance; at a comparatively small cost to the Canadian Government this stream can be made safe for river steamers of the largest tonnage. At present dangerous rapids in the Red River interrupt traffic between Winnipeg and the lake of that name, while some dredging will yet have to be done in the Nelson River. To the credit of the United States Government it may be stated that the portion of the Red River of the North in her territory has been made navigable to steamers for hundreds of miles; and when Canada has completed her part of the work, Liverpool will be brought into direct water communication with the Red River Valley, which raises half a billion bushels of grain any good season. But, fortunately for the commerce of American seaports, Hudson Bay is closed to navigation for a greater part of the grain-moving season.

The distance from Minnesota or the Dakotas to Liverpool by this new all-water route is 3,600 miles, as against about 4,300 miles by rail and water via Boston or New York, as at present. The great saving in cost of transportation, probably fifty per cent, would certainly divert toward the new route much of the traffic of the Northwest during the six months of the year that the Hudson Bay route remains open; and now that ice-breaking boats have demonstrated their ability to keep clear open channels in Arctic waters during the coldest months of winter, the twentieth century will doubtless see a new era of navigation open up from the Ohio to the Yukon.

Although our Government spends more than twenty million dollars annually on the improvement of our rivers, this is but a tithe of what any European nation would devote to the development of such a magnificent system of inland waterways. Every energy of the greatest engineers would be expended on devising means to add an additional inch to the depth of the channels or another mile to the total of the navigable waters. The system in vogue in America of doling out appropriations in driblets, so that often the work accomplished falls into decay long before the next appropriation is available, and has to be done all over again, would bankrupt any other country.

There is one great danger to our waterways which we absolutely ignore. In every other civilized country, and even in India, where there

are as many miles of artificial as natural waterways, the most stringent laws are made and enforced against the denuding of the forest lands. In America, the work of years and the expenditure of millions are often rendered of no value because the country surrounding the newly dredged stream is deforested as fast as the improvements are made, with the result that the waters, no longer held back by the soft soil and the roots of the trees, rush down the denuded hillsides, swelling the stream into a raging torrent which overflows the banks, doing incalculable damage, then swiftly subside, leaving the bed of the river all but exposed. No longer do trickling springs percolate through the shaded soil, to feed the river in summer and fall, when water is most needed for floating down the harvest products; so that only too frequently the Government reports tell of deepened channels and decreased traffic.

New England was the first section to feel the effects of the deforestation of a magnificent area of timber land. Rivers that fifty years ago carried, summer and winter, a steady stream, sufficient to turn many mill-wheels, now race fiercely after every rain, and then dry up almost completely. In the Mississippi Valley the devastating spring freshets are now expected as a matter of course, while in summer time the dredges are kept busily at work digging channels in the shallow bed of the stream. Every year the work of the Government in keeping a channel open is made more difficult; the headwaters of the numerous tributaries of the Mississippi being denuded of their forests. Few realize the enormous quantity of timber that is floated down such rivers as the St. Croix, the Arkansas, the Missouri, and other Western streams. It amounts to many millions of tons annually. Not only is the large timber cut, but every stick of spruce and soft wood is gathered for the paper mills.

The denuding of our forests has reached such an extent that even the smallest trees are sacrificed for the benefit of the press. It is estimated by the large paper mills that the quantity of wood pulp in the entire United States will supply the demand for the next six years only; and the mill owners are now looking about for a substitute. The enormous quantity of this small timber used for paper-making may be faintly imagined when it is stated that there are daily newspapers in Boston and Chicago which devour every morning ten to twelve acres of spruce trees, and that in New York there is one paper at least which consumes sixteen acres every twenty-four hours.

In the deforested portions of the West the soil is a clay loam. Deprived of shade, it quickly bakes in the sun. Over this hard crust the water rushes in torrents without ever penetrating the soil; or on the great

level plains it lies in shallow lakes to be quickly evaporated by the sun. The small rivulets which were once fed continually are now dried up, and the larger streams run dry in summer; yet, in spite of all this, if the waters which now flow in the Mississippi were confined to a narrow channel, there would be a sufficient depth, even in the driest summer, for all the purposes of navigation. More important than all appropriations for river and harbor improvements is the need of proper forestry laws. The reforestation of the denuded lands should be the first step toward the development of our rivers as channels of interstate traffic. Even in certain parts of Africa it is a penal offense to cut certain trees without planting many others to replace them. In years to come, doubtless, the growing of forest trees will become as much an industry in America as raising wheat. A few of our Government millions appropriated for the replanting of our wasted forest lands would in time yield a much greater commercial return to the whole country.

The wealth of nations has always arranged itself along the line of important waterways. Pittsburg, at the head of the Ohio River, was the point from which, a hundred years ago, Eastern emigrants to the Mississippi Valley floated down the great river. It has ever since held its place as the greatest shipping-point west of Philadelphia; over 9,000,-000 tons of merchandise, coal, and iron ore being landed at its wharves every year, from the Ohio, Allegheny, and Monongahela rivers. What will be the increase of traffic when the proposed ship canal to Lake Erie is completed it is impossible to estimate; for not only Pittsburg, but the whole Mississippi Valley, will benefit by this extension of its commerce into a new realm. Half a century ago is alluded to as the period of "flush times" on the Ohio and Mississippi; yet the traffic on these streams is greater in tonnage to-day than ever before. Over a thousand steamboats still navigate the waters of these great rivers; but the steel barge, which has replaced the flat boat and wooden junk, has revolutionized the traffic on our Western waters. A single powerful steamer will now leave Pittsburg for New Orleans with thirty-two barges in tow, freighted with 600,000 bushels of coal, making a trip in fifteen days that would take a hundred freight trains of sixteen cars each all summer to accomplish. In addition, the saving in freight is fully \$160,000, as the cost of transportation per bushel by water is but three cents.

The first steamer to navigate the upper Mississippi reached the present site of St. Paul in 1813, before the first Boston steamer found its way to the waters of Maine. A little later, hundreds of boats began to arrive every summer, and the twin cities were founded. St. Paul is not

to remain much longer the head of steamboat navigation, as the Government is rapidly improving the stream above the Falls of St. Anthony. In time the improvements that will permit steamers to pass St. Paul and proceed to Minneapolis will include a system of canals around the falls; so that several hundred miles of continuous river navigation will be added to the possibilities of the Mississippi. Immense temporary dams, which are to be replaced by permanent masonry, now hold back the waters of the upper Mississippi, so confining them that they will fill the great lakes of central Minnesota. From these immense reservoirs there proceeds in summer a steady, regulated flow of water, which greatly improves navigation, the beneficial effects being felt even below St. Paul. Thus, in a way, are some of the evil effects of deforestry partially overcome.

Some idea of the importance of these upper waters of the Mississippi may be gathered when it is learned that such branches as the Chippewa and St. Croix rivers send down annually to the Mississippi proper from one to two million tons of logs, besides doing a large passenger business on the steamers that ply up and down the improved channels. When the lands which are being cleared of lumber are planted in grain and produce, the traffic of the Illinois River will be duplicated.

The Mississippi between St. Paul and the Missouri, a distance of about 700 miles, is still a cause of constant annoyance. For four months of the year the river is closed to navigation, on account of ice; for another four months, beginning in August, low water predominates, and, but for the incessant work of the powerful government dredges, navigation would come to a standstill. At Keokuk and at Rock Island the river flows over a bed of solid rock, which at low stages is covered by but two feet of water. At Rock Island the Government has removed enough rock to give a serviceable channel, and at Keokuk a three-lock canal has been built.

In spite of these many drawbacks to navigation, about 3,000,000 tons of freight and many thousand passengers pass up and down the river each year between the mouth of the Missouri and St. Paul. The problem of permanently improving the channel of the Mississippi has proved one of the most vexing ones that the engineers and Congress have ever had to deal with. For many years, steamboat owners, at their own expense, kept scrapers at work on the upper river, removing the bars formed by spring freshets, bars left almost exposed at low water. The Government also adopted the scraping system. By this method bars were deepened from eight to eighteen inches in a few hours, so that large steamers could ascend the river to St. Paul; but as it cost \$20,000 a

season for each scraper in service, the Government decided to experiment with plans for securing a permanent channel, and is still doing so.

A system of dykes and jetties was begun, with the object in view of concentrating the stream; but the work was so slow and the clamor of the steamboat men, who saw their business dwindling to nothing, so great, that the system of scraping and dredging was again resorted to as an indefinite expedient. It was suggested in Congress that a prize of \$100,000 be offered for the most successful plan that would be submitted for keeping open a permanent channel in the river. In fact, one Congressional Committee went so far as to spend \$40,000 on a chimerical invention which proposed, by means of a great perforated iron pipe laid in the bed of the river, to maintain a channel. Water was to be pumped into the pipe every hundred miles. The water was to be forced through the perforations and thus stir up the sand and keep it in suspension, while the current was to do the rest. The plan was never put into operation.

Another inventor offered to provide a ten-foot channel the year round, between St. Louis and Cairo, by means of an immense steel boat with great wings of the same metal. The current was to force the boat through the bars by cutting the sand about the wings. Torpedoes were tried, but unsuccessfully; and then hydraulic water jets for keeping the sand in constant motion were experimented with, and this method promised to supersede the ordinary dredge system. All possible devices, from temporary canvas jetties to permanent canal locks, are now in operation at various places from northern Minnesota to the Gulf of Mexico.

Were it not for the fact that the Missouri spreads itself over so great a width, washing away miles of its prairie banks annually, and thus shoaling its bed, doubtless this river system, with its 3,000 miles of navigable waterway, would have been utilized, almost to the same extent as the upper Mississippi has been, in developing tributary country. As it was, far back in the early part of the century, the American Fur Company sent its steamers up into Montana in search of pelts. At present it is possible to travel by steamer away up in the mountain region, in the valley near Helena, the capital of Montana. At Great Falls a system of canals will doubtless some day connect the navigable portion of the upper with the lower river; for from Fort Benton to New Orleans it is already possible for steamers to navigate, and every year the Government is improving conditions. In fact, during the decade just ended steamboat traffic on the upper waters of the Missouri has been more than doubled; while its most rapid tributary, the Yellowstone, has been so improved that steamers now ply its waters regularly.

Important as is the part that this great stream must some day play in the development of the Northwest, by determining freight rates for a country large enough to form an empire, it is still a distant second to the less mighty Arkansas system. Over half a million people in Arkansas, Indian Territory, and Kansas are in a measure dependent on the 2,500 miles of navigable waterways flowing through the State of Arkansas to the Mississippi River. Millions of tons of freight find their way up and down these rivers; and new sections are being opened up continually, as the Government makes other tributary streams navigable. Whole counties depend entirely on this system of waterways for communication with the outer world.

Even in this age of railways the real value of our rivers has not abated one jot. In fact, the development brought about by the railways is making our waterways more and more a source of wealth to the country at large. The railways have compelled the steamboats and barges to reduce their freight rates to a minimum, with the result that new industries are opening up in what have been hitherto considered backwoods districts. A dozen rivers with names unfamiliar to most readers, flowing through Kentucky, Tennessee, and some of our Western States, now accommodate a traffic of over a million tons each.

Ten years ago, the tonnage floated on the rivers of the Mississippi Valley was estimated at 29,000,000 tons, an increase of 10,000,000 tons over the traffic of ten years earlier. Because Congress, although appropriating millions each session for the improvement of our rivers, fails to say that boatmen shall report the tonnage carried in their vessels on inland waters, it is impossible accurately to estimate the annual tonnage borne on our streams. However, it is very certain that the traffic of the rivers of the Mississippi Valley at present exceeds a total of 35,000,000 tons, probably approaching more nearly the 40,000,000 mark. What it will amount to at the close of another decade will depend largely upon the completion of the Nicaragua Canal, the deepening of the Illinois River to the Chicago canal, and the amount Congress appropriates for the extension of the work of improvement, now just fairly begun, on the rivers of the Mississippi Valley. This system of waterways seems destined to be by far the most important in America, once it is properly connected with the waterways of the East. Presidents and statesmen have over and over again impressed upon our short-sighted Congressmen the wisdom of making appropriations commensurate with the immensity of the advantages to accrue from the improvement of the Mississippi and its branches; but the sum thus far expended on such betterments, while

exceeding \$100,000,000, is nevertheless ridiculously small as compared with what European countries, although groaning under the expense of maintaining immense standing armies, have spent on the extension of their inland roadsteads.

Thanks to the fifty-odd millions Canada has spent in making the St. Lawrence navigable to vessels drawing fourteen feet of water, our Lake cities are now building ocean steamers to ply between Duluth, Chicago, Buffalo, and Liverpool; while the traffic in American vessels on the St. Lawrence, now estimated at 2,000,000 tons, promises to take a sudden leap that will astonish the world. But after all, Canada will probably be the great gainer. Such a channel from Chicago to New Orleans would not only develop new cities all along the Mississippi, but would tend to divert South American traffic from Europe to the United States, where it logically belongs, and to open up a new line of communication with South Africa, where our rapidly increasing trade is already causing English merchants and manufacturers much uneasiness.

Unfortunately for the South Pacific coast, there are no great waterways flowing from the interior to the ocean; so that freight rates are abnormally high. Even Oregon and Washington are deprived of the greater portion of the benefits which should be theirs from the possession of such a mighty stream as the Columbia, second only in volume of water to the Mississippi; for although it is navigable for more than 1,000 miles, 200 miles from the mouth are to be found the Dalles, or rapids, which totally obstruct navigation.

The Government has spent a considerable amount in securing rights of way for a ship railway around these rapids; but engineers now advise a system of canals and locks, such as would pass the largest steamboats. This would open up a vast wheat-growing country not yet penetrated by railroads. Most of the grain grown in this region is shipped to Asia and Europe. A continuous waterway from the lakes of northern Idaho to Portland, the shipping port of that section, could not fail to add greatly to the productive wealth of the entire Northwest. The traffic on the lower Columbia and the Willamette rivers is still less than 2,000,000 tons per annum; the Dalles almost completely shutting off the lower river from the products of the interior. A somewhat larger traffic is done on Puget Sound and on the rivers emptying into it; but with the rapidly increasing trade of America with Asia, every thing should be put in readiness for the enormous traffic that must begin to pass over these waters of the West before many more years have gone by. Seattle, Portland, and San Francisco are cities that will some day be as important to the

West and to Asia, as Boston, New York, and Philadelphia are to-day to the East and to all Europe. The completion of the Nicaragua Canal will bring the rivers of the two coasts of America many thousands of miles nearer together. The 400 miles of navigable rivers in California, flowing into San Francisco Bay, will doubtless eventually carry as great a volume of traffic as does the Hudson.

Sometimes we seek afar off what we should look for near our home. That is just what we are doing at present; for all the wealth of the Philippines and all the trade we can ever hope to have with the Indies will never equal in value or amount what we have along the banks of our rivers ready to be floated from place to place within our own country, enriching section after section of our land as it passes in transition from raw material to manufactured article and finished product, ready again for distribution. The most successful colonizing country of the world to-day is Holland. It may be a mere coincidence, but it is nevertheless a fact well worthy of consideration, that this little country has spent far more money in improving her means of inland water communication than she has on her colonies; and the canals bring her a greater return in the end. So far the Philippines have cost us over \$100,000,000. Such an amount spent on our rivers every two years for a single generation would bring about a development of our agricultural, mineral, and manufacturing interests unparalleled in the industrial history of any country, to say nothing of the increase of traffic, foreign and domestic.

We cannot do better than China, an uncivilized nation that has solved the problem of supporting nearly half the population of the globe — a miracle impossible of performance had not the Government doubled the length of the navigable waterways by artificial methods. On these Chinese waterways, navigated only by junks, more tonnage is moved annually than on all other inland waters of the world. The canals and rivers bind the eighteen provinces of China together. These narrow bands of water have held them as one for a thousand years.

It might be well for us to accept the advice of John C. Calhoun, taking for a twentieth-century motto the words of the great nullifier, as embodied in Chicago's memorial to Congress concerning the building of her great ship canal: "Let us bind the Republic together, let us conquer space by a perfect system of roads and canals." If the general Government refuses to listen to that appeal to build a great system of interstate ship canals, the States might, with perfect safety, apply a little of Mr. Calhoun's States' right doctrine, and build it themselves.

ALEXANDER HUME FORD.

THE HAGUE PEACE CONFERENCE.

THE FORUM, I believe, owes to its readers some review of the admirable treatise by Mr. Frederick W. Holls,¹ one of the six American delegates at The Hague, who has given to us what will be a leading authority on the history of the great Peace Conference.

Mr. Irving said to me, not long before his death, that the rub-a-dub has much more interest for the average reader of history, and for the average writer of history, than do the years — much more important than battles — which go to the establishment of states and the advance of civilization.

This is true, it is too true. And, at the same time, it is true that the literature of International Law, which is, in practice, the history of advancing civilization, is shut off from the history of what are called events. The development of international intercourse, in commerce, in travel, and in social order, is described by one set of men in one set of books. And it is not handled, it is hardly attempted, by the writers who describe for us battles by land and sea, or who, perhaps, go so far afield as to tell us of the fall of a dynasty or the birth of an infant, if that infant happens to be born in the purple.

Now, this entire separation of the history of outside facts and the history of advancing civilization is a misfortune. It leaves the "average reader" quite in the dark as to most points on which he ought to know something if he would do his duty as a voter, as an educator of public opinion, or as a leader of society.

Meanwhile, there grow up, all the same, a class of men who do care to know what have been the real steps of advance. Outside such special matters as those to which the Congress at The Hague call our present attention, the battle of the Nile or the battle of Austerlitz has, in itself,

¹"The Peace Conference at The Hague and Its Bearings on International Law and Policy," by Frederick W. Holls, D.C.L. "Justicia elevat gentem." New York: The Macmillan Company. "The International Court of Arbitration," by the same author. A paper read before the New York State Bar Association, January 15, 1901.

no value, nor even interest, as a bit of history. The value or interest of such battles depends upon the social changes which followed from them, on the steps upward and forward which civilization has made because of them. Some men interest themselves in such steps in human society. They exist, perhaps, in quiet life in all civilized nations. In the nations most civilized there are the most of them.

The great Peace Conference at The Hague called to the front a hundred such men. Not one in ten of them is named in such books of fame as "Who's Who"; nor is one in ten of them ever mentioned, even by accident, by the "Associated Press," which is the "Herald King-at-Arms" of modern life. But they are men known in cabinets. They are advised with by princes, ministers, and secretaries of foreign affairs. They know something, and what they know can be anchored to, and this is more than you can say of most men. This is a condition of very great value as we watch the whirlpool of daily life, where a stray log pops up at one moment, and a man swimming for his life at another; and you want to have somebody at hand who can tell which is the man and which is the log.

Now, in the early months of 1899, nobody believed much in The Hague Conference; but, at the same time, no ruler meant to make a mistake about it. The responsible people, therefore, sent to it one hundred of the men who knew about treaties and international relations, and who had given them good advice in the last twenty, thirty, nay, fifty years — the best-informed hundred men, and, on the whole, the hundred men least prejudiced, who have ever sat down to one purpose since the world began.

Mr. Holls, who is more of an artist than he thinks he is, has, in his admirable history of the Conference, given us, almost without thinking of it, an excellent view of the place and its surroundings. Mr. Stead,¹ in his article in THE FORUM, has sketched some of the outlines. Everybody knows that The Hague is a very charming place. All the people there, including the members of the government, etc., were pleased that The Hague was, in a way, acknowledged as the centre of the civilized world; and so everybody honored himself and honored the Conference by the most assiduous hospitality.

"May decked the world, and Wilhelmina filled the throne."

The line limps a little as one substitutes for "Arthur" the pretty name of the young queen, but the interest and charm of her personality, at an

¹ See THE FORUM for September, 1899.

era of her life so critical, will be an excuse for the halting prosody. It was on a perfect spring day that the Conference was opened, on the eighteenth of May. This day had been chosen because it was the birthday of Nicholas II, to whose initiative was due the agreement of twenty-six independent nations to meet for a purpose so important. At ten in the morning the Russian delegation, with the members of the Russian Legation, went in full uniform to the small chapel of the Greek Church, where a Te Deum was chanted. At two in the afternoon the Peace Conference was opened. This meeting and the subsequent meetings were held in the palace — which will now be more famous than ever — which is the summer palace of the Dutch royal family. It is about a mile from the city, in the beautiful park known as the Bosch. The "Huis ten Bosch," or House in the Wood, is its popular name. The finest of the magnificently decorated rooms of this palace is the Oranje Zaal, or ball-room. This was finished by Jordaens and other pupils of Rubens in 1647, in honor of Prince Frederick Henry of Orange. In this room the full Conference met.

Four rows of semi-circular tables, giving one hundred seats, had been arranged in the form of a parliamentary hall. The presiding officer's chair itself had been placed in the bay window. The seats were allotted in alphabetical order, in the French language. That Providence of which a Portuguese diplomatist once said that it takes equal care of drunkards, crazy people, and the United States had arranged that "Amerique" and "Allemagne" (Germany) should come at the top of the alphabet. So our six delegates "got the best," if we may use the fine national phrase, and shared with the German delegates the seats of honor, in the centre of the room, directly in front of the chair. There was very little room for spectators. But this made the less difference, because the sessions were all strictly private, excepting on occasions of ceremony.

As our readers know from Mr. Stead's article, before referred to, the work divided itself, of course, under three heads; and, in truth, three "conventions" followed from this subdivision, which are as distinct from one another as if they had been made by one conference at The Hague, another at Paris, and another at Geneva. But the general Conference had the good sense to accept, almost without alteration, these results of what may be called its sub-committees. In the same spirit Mr. Holls has subdivided his history into three parts. Not attempting a chronological order of work for the whole session of the Conference, he gives in his Chapter III the work of the first Committee, in Chapter IV the work of the second Committee, and in Chapter V the work of the third Commit-

tee, which includes the establishment of the Commissions of Inquiry and Arbitration, and what was done in the way of "good offices" and "mediation." This last has probably the most general interest, and may be called, indeed, the most important subdivision. But Committees Number I and Number II have made advances in the international system of the world which are truly important, and which would always be called so were they not in a way overshadowed by the establishment of the High Court of Nations, by Committee Number III.

Committee Number I was called in convention the "Disarmament Committee"; and in general conversation among persons who know little about the Conference, and among those who wish to discredit it, the Conference is generally called the "Disarmament Conference." This is a pity, seeing that the word disarmament does not appear in its proceedings from the beginning until the end. But in the original circular of Emperor Nicholas, dated August 24, 1898, the very first lines spoke of a "possible reduction of excessive armament." In the English Ambassador's despatch of the next day, he said distinctly that Count Mouravieff had said that the Emperor "did not invite a general disarmament."

But, all the same, all that class of people who like to say that a new thing is impossible seized on the words "reduction of armaments," for the purpose of showing that the Emperor's scheme was purely Utopian. Baron Staal, in one of his opening speeches, referred to the false impression which had thus been given. Confessing that the Conference could in no way interfere with the independent acts of sovereign states, he did say: "This is the place to ask whether the welfare of peoples does not demand a limitation of progressive armaments." "The welfare of peoples" is a fine phrase taken from the end of Baron Mouravieff's first circular.

With the absolute avowal by the representatives^s of the Tsar, and by other leading powers, that no one proposed any plan for diminishing the existing military force of any nation, or, indeed, for interfering in any way with its sovereignty, it might have been supposed that the First Committee, so called, had lost the reason of its existence. But there were, in fact, referred to it three clauses of Count Mouravieff's second circular, treating of the "Humanizing of War"; and the results of its discussions on this subject appear in what is known as "the Convention regarding the Laws and Customs of War by Land." Recognizing as a part of international law the Geneva Convention, it consists of sixty articles, and may be considered as the Code of the Laws of War as they now exist among the nations which agree to this "Convention." The general subjects, under the head "Belligerents," are:

On the Qualifications of Belligerents,
On Prisoners of War,
On the Sick and Wounded.

Under the head "Hostilities," seven articles treat of the Means of Injuring the Enemy, of Sieges, and of Bombardments, and three treat of Spies. The third chapter covers Flags of Truce; the fourth, Capitulations; the fifth, Armistices.

A separate section regulates Military Authority in Hostile Territory. One short article, No. 47, worth remembering just now, is entitled, "Pillage is absolutely prohibited." The fourth general section regulates the Detention of Belligerents and the Care of the Wounded in Neutral Countries.

It has been well said that if The Hague Conference had done nothing but to place these rules intelligently on paper, and to secure for them the assent of a considerable number of civilized powers, it would have fully justified its existence. In fact, however, the importance of these rules seems so overshadowed by the great "Convention" which creates the High Court of Nations, that they have been generally overlooked in the estimate made of the value of the Conference to mankind.

To this "Convention" there are added two "Conventions," or agreements, binding on such powers only as assent to them. The first prohibits for five years the launching, in war-time, of projectiles or explosives from balloons; and in the second, the powers agreeing to it promise to abstain from the use of bullets which expand or flatten easily in the human body. This is the "dum-dum bullet" question, of which it may be safely said that the man who rushes into it hastily, who is not an expert, is certainly a fool. This is sure, that angels would be very cautious in undertaking its discussion without scientific preparation.

These determinations alone, as has been said, would have given the "Conference of the One Hundred" a distinguished place in history. But its crowning work, that which gives to it its name, is the first agreement, or "Convention," that which establishes a High Court of Nations. The title to the first article in this "Convention" expresses the central reason for the existence of the Conference. It is on the maintenance of a general peace.

It is now generally known that the initiative in the assembly of the measures which have proved so important is due to the resolute union of England and America. The Russian Emperor may well have been discouraged by the halting interest which the rest of the civilized world had taken in his original proposal. It had even been bitterly assailed

in its weakest points; it was in England and America only that it found full sympathy in its great central purpose. It should never be forgotten that Lord Salisbury's formal reply to Count Mouravieff's first circular contains the most cordial expression of the resolution of the Queen's government to join in any practical endeavor for the maintenance of peace. And, at this moment, it is impossible to forget that in this greatest matter of all, his great sovereign had in every way expressed her sympathy in a purpose so worthy of an empress and of a woman. That it was possible for nations to create a court supreme enough to hear and to decide on such questions as diplomacy of the feudal patterns cannot settle—this had been asserted in the Salisbury-Olney treaty, which will not soon be forgotten. Its details were not perhaps fit for all purposes. When, indeed, does the first model of a new invention answer all the requisites of experiment? But it had said that a High Court was possible.

In America there was—and for generations had been—a strong popular undercurrent in the same direction. War is an incident to us, and not a permanent occupation. This is the ground theory of the American people. When it is time to fight, they must all fight; when that time is over, they must all go to work in peaceful industries. That is their practice. It is not perhaps enough remembered that Charles I had no standing army, that Charles II and James II had to raise the greater part of their forces for the special purposes of this or that occasion; and that what we should now call a Standing Army had no existence in England until William III's reign, and then was introduced only on a moderate scale, and with the stimulus of the great Continental Wars.

To the colonists in America, therefore, from 1607 to 1770, the sight of a soldier in the streets, in time of peace—except on the few armed days of parade of the "train-band"—was unknown. When the train-bands were exercised everybody was a soldier for the moment. As soon as he put back "his Queen's arm" into the closet, where, be it observed, he kept it himself, he ceased to be a soldier; and there were no soldiers until the Indians, the Jesuits, or the French brought about a state of war. Just as every farmer had a workshop in which he could make a hoe-handle or mend an ox-yoke, every farmer had a gun and a powder-horn. But, precisely because he had these, the farmer did not create an organized proxy of soldiers to do his fighting.

Accordingly, the Declaration of Independence rightly charges George III with an innovation, when it says he has introduced "standing armies" into the colonies. And, in historical fact, nothing excited and irritated

the colonists so much as to see "the lobsters," as they called the red-coats, loafing in the streets, or playing skittles or bowls, or drinking in the shops, when there was no war. When war came every American had to shoulder his firelock. Chastellux said, in 1781, that between Rhode Island and Virginia, in the new States of Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, he never saw a man of the military age who had not served in the ranks against the King. But with peace this man forgot that he had been a soldier. There is a fine story of the Connecticut blacksmith, who, when he shod Rochambeau's horse, inquired of the rider what he did "when he was to hum."

Peace, and permanent peace, is the cry of the American people. It is not simply their dream; it is their expectation. And they had so far had their own way that in 117 years since their independence, they had had but four years' war with foreign nations, while under the flag of Great Britain, in the century before their independence, they had been at war nearly half the time. For 111 years, when The Hague Conference met, they had had a Supreme Court which had power to settle all questions but one between forty-five States which it united. That great exception had cost them four years of civil war. This people, of Teutonic origin, with such a history and such prejudices, believes in an accord of nations, and that a permanent tribunal is possible, which can inquire into their quarrels, and can pronounce judgment upon them before they begin to fight with each other. To the American citizen such a belief is not a matter of dream or of theory. It represents a visible business in his daily life. Thus, the boundary questions between Massachusetts and Rhode Island, between Missouri and Iowa, which anywhere else would have been settled by war, have been settled by the Supreme Court of the United States. It may well be that half the citizens of those four States do not know, at this moment, that there were ever such questions.

There are some illustrations, fairly amusing, of the readiness with which the American people expressed its wish in this business. Thus, on the Sunday which followed the 24th of August, the date of the Emperor's original rescript of peace, the First Congregational Church of Columbus, Ohio, voted to send a letter to the Emperor of Russia, to tell him that it approved of his plans, and would assist in carrying them out. We cannot conceive of a more democratic constituency in the world than that which thus addresses, on equal terms, the Autocrat who commands the largest army in the world. In this case the Emperor at once directed a courteous reply.

The Administration at Washington fully comprehended the demand

for permanent peace, thus deeply seated. The appointment of delegates was admirable. Besides Mr. Newell, our representative minister in Holland, Captain Mahan represented the Navy, Captain Crozier the Army, and Mr. Andrew D. White, Mr. Seth Low, and Mr. Frederick W. Holls represented Peace; and this meant a permanent tribunal. This goes vastly further than any vague, or rather, spongy, agreement, like that of the Pan-American Congress, to refer to "Arbitration" any unsolved questions. It establishes the High Court before which each case shall be tried; and it squarely promises that, when it is possible, each case shall be submitted.

The Government did not fail to let it be understood that this was the great thing it cared for. Yes! we should be glad to have private property exempt from capture at sea. Yes! we shall vote for any thing which will humanize war. But, first, second, and last, we are going to The Hague for a "permanent tribunal." That we mean to have. Give us that, and you can postpone "to a more convenient season" every thing else which you cannot settle.

It will prove that our diplomatic agents made the Powers understand, in unofficial conversation, as in official documents, that this was what we stood for: the High Court of Nations. And, to use the vernacular again, we were not "sot" as to the method. The New York Bar had proposed six judges in the High Court, with assessors to be appointed by the smaller states. For England and America, Lord Salisbury and Mr. Olney had suggested seven or nine judges. But from first to last our representatives showed a catholic disposition; and, so we could get the substance, which is "a permanent tribunal," the nations might arrange the details much as the Continental jurists thought best. The result seems to have been studied from the constitution of the Supreme Court of the State of New York. That is to say, the Supreme Tribunal consists of a "panel," so to speak, of eighty or more jurists, appointed by the twenty-six nations. And from this "panel" a special court of five, seven, nine, or eleven is summoned, as each separate case may require. No nation may name more than four of the judges in the High Court. Two nations may agree on the same judge if they will. The members shall be appointed for a term of six years, and their appointment may be renewed. Whenever the Powers wish to resort to the Court, they may make a special arrangement for that occasion; or, if they make no special arrangement, each party shall name from the general list of the Court two arbitrators, and these together shall choose an umpire. The Court shall ordinarily sit at The Hague. The judges selected

are to be of "recognized competence in questions of International Law, enjoying the highest moral reputation, and disposed to accept the duties of arbitrators." The appointments already made show that the Powers interested understand how to keep up to the high requisition.

Mr. Holls is at his very best — and that is saying a great deal — in his narrative of the work of the Third Committee, which had in hand the forging out, from the crude ore, the finished Treaty of Arbitration. He gives to it, as it deserves, a large part of his narrative. The work of the other two committees was, from its nature, technical, and to be wrought out by experts. "The task assigned to the Third Committee, on the other hand, was essentially diplomatic in its nature, touching the sovereignty of states most directly, and comprising possibilities of great and serious danger."

Of the discussion, the deliberation with which the result was wrought out, Mr. Holls gives a detailed narrative, with some mention of every important speech, and, in many instances, with reports of speeches, often from his own careful notes. To these speeches, even in their details, there attaches an unusual interest; for it must be remembered that here, for once, is a real deliberative assembly. Ten or twenty distinguished men came together with the simple determination to "get the best"; and one may fairly say that when they began no one of them was quite sure what that best was. But they meant to find out; they meant to impress their own convictions as well as they could. Here then is speaking for a purpose. There is the determination to convince, if possible; but all the same there is willingness to learn. There are ten or twenty persons who are to agree. And there is absolutely no line of cleavage between two or three different parties. In the debates of our own American Constitutional Convention you can trace such lines, but not here. No! Here are the "chief delegates" from each of twenty-six nations, with the occasional presence of honorary officers.

The discussion is serious, but sometimes it almost takes the form of animated conversation; sometimes it has all the dignity of a Supreme Court hearing an "opinion" from one of its members. Those members are, as has been intimated, men of distinguished ability and rare learning. They are of the class of men whom governments consult in difficult crises, more often perhaps than they call them into the class of daily service. They may not often appear before the foot-lights, but very likely there would be no drama if such men were not somewhere. Prince Münster, the senior delegate for Germany, was the only "chief delegate" who did not appear in form on this Committee, his advanced age being the only

reason for this omission. "I have served the Emperor with my best ability," he said, somewhere in the course of the Conference, "for half a century."

The names best known to American readers are, perhaps, those of Mr. White, Mr. Low, and Mr. Holls, our own delegates, the Duke of Tetuan from Spain, Mr. Delyannis from Greece, MM. Staal and De Martens from Russia, Baron Bildt from Sweden, and Dr. Roth from Switzerland. This acquaintance with names, however, is rather a matter of accident. The names of Baron Hayashi from Japan, of Yang Yu, Lou-Tseng-Tsiang, and Hoo-Wei-Teh from China, Gen. Mirza Riza Khan from Persia, and M. Phya Suriya from Siam, are, naturally, not so familiar to us. Mexico was the only American country represented besides our own. Her delegates on this Committee were MM. Mier and Zenil.

The full Committee had nine meetings. At its first meeting it yielded to what seemed a necessity, and voted that its proceedings should be private. This decision brought down on the whole Conference the wrath of the leading journals of the world, in their sentence of disapproval, from which, perhaps, it has not yet recovered. But one has only to read the details of the proceedings to see that the world could not have obtained the great result it did obtain had not this decision been made at the beginning.

At the session of May 20, M. Bourgeois, the chairman, suggested that all propositions relating to good offices, arbitration and mediation, be referred to a Sub-Committee. This was done; and this Sub-Committee became really the body which drew up the important plans, first for Commissions of Inquiry, and, second, for the High Court of Arbitration.

I am sorry that it is impossible for me to attempt even the briefest sketch of the instructive debates on these two propositions. I must be satisfied with citing Mr. Holls's important statement regarding the first, that the institution of Commissions of Inquiry is quite likely to be of far greater practical importance than any other result of the Conference. M. Nelidoff described the provision for "Special Mediation" as the entrusting of the settlement of the affair in question to seconds on each side, who will act "according to instructions," and who will each defend the honor of his principal as he would his own. The parallel drawn by Mr. Holls between this provision and those successive steps by which private war has been abolished, or nearly abolished, is very curious. The article on Commissions of Inquiry, as it stands, reads:

"Article IX. In differences of an international nature, involving neither honor nor vital interests, and arising from a difference of opinion on matters of fact, the

signatory powers recommend that parties who have not been able to come to an agreement by diplomatic methods, should, as far as circumstances allow, institute an International Commission of Inquiry, to facilitate a solution of the differences by elucidating the facts, by means of an impartial and conscientious investigation."

The provisions thus far described are contained in the first fourteen articles of the principal "Convention," called the "First Convention," in the official report. The remainder of the "First Convention," and that part by which, thus far, it is generally remembered, is contained in the elaborate articles on the High Court of Arbitration. It comprises all the remaining articles from the fifteenth to the sixty-first. It is of the system thus inaugurated, the "Magna Charta of Nations," as Mr. Holls calls it, that the late General Garrison spoke so well in his closing speech before the Venezuelan tribunal. He called The Hague Conference "one of the greatest assemblies of the nations which the world has yet seen." Addressing the President of the Venezuelan tribunal, M. de Martens, he says:

"There was nothing, Mr. President, in your proceedings at The Hague that so much attracted my approbation and interest as the proposition to constitute a Permanent Court of Arbitration. It seems to me that if this process of settling international differences is to commend itself to the nations, it can only hope to set up for the trial of such questions an absolutely impartial judicial tribunal."

This view, so simply stated by General Garrison, and presented at the very outset by the leading members of the Comité d'Examen, worked itself into the whole tissue of the great Arbitration Treaty. The High Court is not to inquire as to facts; it is a purely judicial tribunal, to receive the results of inquiry. It is not to compromise "by the rule of give and take"; it is to make judicial decisions regarding the substantiated facts. It holds to the object proposed by Lord Pauncefote in the beginning: "It is absolutely necessary to organize a Permanent International Tribunal, which can be called together immediately at the request of contending nations."

This proposal struck the key-note. The Russian proposal for a Permanent Court was introduced at once, then the British proposal and the American proposal. The British proposal became the basis of deliberation. M. Descamps suggested what seemed to him improvements, and it was then that Dr. Zorn presented the objections of the government of Germany. Here was the crisis of the Convention. A very important speech by Mr. Holls, and a very important visit made by him and Dr. Zorn to Berlin, removed the objections which had been so well stated by Dr. Zorn in his speech. One is disposed to read between the lines, and to guess that the opposition in Germany had not been an op-

position to the principle of the Treaty, but had been cultivated, if we may say so, by the fears of the German lawyers as to the possible independence of the proposed court. The cordial agreement of the German Empire was secured so soon as it appeared certain that no one proposed compulsory arbitration.

As I have said, however, we must not even attempt the slightest sketch of the several debates. Enough to say that on July 29, the Treaty was signed by the representatives of sixteen Powers, and that it has since been signed and ratified by all the Powers represented.

Mr. Holls's chapter on "The Conference from Day to Day" is both entertaining and instructive. It throws many side-lights on what may be called the working methods of the high diplomacy. He preserves in a separate chapter the details of the dignified position of this country on the question of the seizure of private property on the seas. This is one of the great subjects reserved for future discussion.

Mr. Holls's closing chapter is of profound interest and importance. In twenty pages, quite too few, he states "the bearings of the Conference upon International Law and Policy." "The time had come to make the expression International Law a reality, instead of the cover for a miscellaneous collection of moral precepts and rules of intercourse." It is in this chapter that he uses that fine phrase, "The Magna Charta of International Law." He says truly:

"A text-book of International Law, without a careful discussion of The Hague Treaty for the Peaceful Adjustment of International Differences, is hereafter quite as unthinkable as a history of English Constitutional Law containing no reference to Magna Charta or the Bill of Rights."

This masterly chapter should be studied not only in schools of law, but in all schools of the higher education. For we must all take care that the generation which created The Hague Conference shall comprehend its purpose, and know what are its achievements. Mr. Holls truly says that it is most encouraging that on the Continent of Europe the governments are in advance of public opinion on the entire subject. In this country we must all see to it that public opinion shall be thoroughly informed as to what has been done and as to what is still possible. For such a purpose we are already largely indebted to the distinguished members of the Conference making their reports each in his own way. This country and the world are very greatly indebted to Mr. Holls for the admirable narrative which we have severely condensed, which is destined to take an important place in the written history of the civilized world.

EDWARD E. HALE.

PROHIBITION IN KANSAS.

IN view of the recent Prohibition excitement in Kansas, and, further, in view of the conflicting and false impressions which are current among the people of other States concerning the provisions of the Kansas prohibitory liquor law and the actual status of Prohibition in the State, it would seem that an impartial statement covering these important matters, by one who has been long on the ground and is familiar with the situation, would be timely and in order. The prohibitory amendment to our State constitution, adopted November, 1880, says: "The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors shall be forever prohibited in this State, except for medical, mechanical, and scientific purposes." The legislation which has been enacted to carry the provisions of the amendment into effect limits the business of selling liquors, for the excepted purposes, exclusively to certain druggists, who must first procure permits to sell from the probate judge of the county; so that no person other than a druggist who holds a legal permit can lawfully sell any kind of intoxicating liquor in Kansas for any purpose whatever.

Such being our constitution and our laws relating to this matter, and these being twenty years old, or thereabouts, it is astounding to find, in "Harper's Weekly," for February 16, 1901, an editorial statement to the effect that the legislature, a few years ago, passed an act authorizing the sale of liquors on the semi-annual payment of stipulated fines. This is the "Weekly's" exact language:

"The legal status of the Kansas saloons . . . is curious. A Prohibition amendment to the State's constitution was passed, but after the United States Supreme Court decided that no State could prohibit the admission of original packages of intoxicants into its borders, it was not difficult for Kansans who wanted liquor to get it. Presently so many saloons sprung up and flourished in the cities that the Legislature, repining at the loss of revenue from unlawful saloons which paid no license fees, provided, in 1893, that the illegal saloons which complied with certain prescribed regulations, should be free from interference, except that twice a year their owners should be arrested and fined. That gave Kansas practically a license system. The constitution contains a Prohibition amendment which the Legislature has bound itself not to enforce against saloons that comply with prescribed regulations."

No such legislation as the "Weekly" sets up has ever been enacted in Kansas. It would have been in open and flagrant violation of the

constitution. What has misled the "Journal of Civilization" is, doubtless, the common practice in most of the larger cities and towns of the State of protecting illicit trade in liquors without any legislation — simply collecting certain amounts of money, previously agreed upon, from such joint-keepers as can pay, and prohibiting those that cannot or will not pay. This fine business is all unlawful. The Supreme Court of the State settled that matter fifteen years ago, in cases brought against the cities of Topeka and Leavenworth.

Our prohibitory legislation has all been through the courts; and the result, in a few words, is that in Kansas any thing and every thing in the nature of a drinking saloon, tippling shop, dram shop, or joint, is unlawful from any and every point of view. Intoxicating liquors may be lawfully sold in Kansas for medical, mechanical, and scientific purposes only, and nobody other than a legally permitted druggist may sell for these purposes. Hence the person whom we designate a joint-keeper deliberately and defiantly puts himself outside the law every time he sells a glass of whiskey or a mug of beer to any person for any purpose. Furthermore, the place in which he carries on the unlawful traffic was long ago declared to be a public nuisance.

This kind of legislation differs from criminal laws generally in one important particular. If a horse be stolen, a house burglarized, or a man beaten or robbed, the offence is primarily one against property or person, and hence it is presumed that the personal interest of the individual most immediately concerned is sufficient to move him to give information of the offence to the authorities; but in the case of unlawful liquor selling, the offence is against neither person nor property. The person who buys the liquor wants it for his own use. He asks for it, pays for it, and drinks it, or carries it away for future use. The offence is not against the person or his property, but against the whole people in their organized capacity as a State. It is not against one, but against all, taken as one, that the seller has sinned. No one person is more interested in the transaction than another, for all are equally concerned as citizens or residents of the State. It is not such an offence as would ordinarily and naturally move the average citizen to notify the law officers, even if he were present at its commission and knew all about it.

The offence being against the public, obviously public officers ought to look after the case. And so our law provides:

"It shall be the duty of all sheriffs, deputy sheriffs, constables, mayors, marshals, police judges, and police officers of any city or town, having notice or knowledge of any violation of this law to notify the county attorney."

That officer is then required to investigate the case and to prosecute it just as he does other cases. And if the county attorney fails or refuses to proceed, or if, for any other reason, this law is not enforced in any county, the attorney-general of the State is required to appoint one or more assistant attorney-generals—as many as he sees fit for that county—for the purpose of enforcing this particular law. It will thus be seen that our laws and legal machinery are amply sufficient for the complete execution of the prohibitory law in every part of the State; and it is a fact that whenever and wherever the officers that are charged with its execution have faithfully done their duty as the law provides, there has been no more difficulty in enforcing this law than there has been in enforcing the law against any other offence.

During the years 1885 to 1889, inclusive, this law was well executed in all parts of the State except in the larger cities. Mr. John A. Martin was Governor then. In his message of January, 1887, referring to this subject, he said :

“A great reform has certainly been effected. Intemperance is steadily and surely decreasing. . . . That intoxicating liquors are sold as a beverage anywhere within the limits of Kansas is not because of faults in our laws touching this question. . . . There is not a town, city, or neighborhood in the State in which an illegal traffic in liquors can be carried on for a single week, if the local officers discharge the duties plainly enjoined upon them by law, with zeal and fidelity.”

In his last message, January, 1889, Governor Martin said :

“Except in a few of the larger cities, all hostility to our temperance laws has disappeared. . . . The business of the police court in our larger cities has dwindled to one-fourth its former proportions, while in cities of the second and third class, the occupation of police authorities is practically gone.”

We were about four years in getting started on prohibition lines; and Governor Martin made it plain that official honesty, energy, and good faith could handle this law as well as any other. But the next administration was not so vigilant. In 1890–91 the decline began; prohibition machinery got into “practical politics,” and was used for political purposes; and conditions have grown worse from that day to this. The Republican party championed the prohibitory amendment from the beginning down to 1894. In 1896 the State convention refused to insert the usual endorsement in the party platform. In 1898 and 1900 the subject was utterly ignored; and our present Governor refuses to have any thing to do with it.

In a carefully prepared report by an experienced and thoroughly competent agent of the State Temperance Union, submitted a little more than a year ago, it was stated that 129 towns had been visited and canvassed,

and that of these 129 places, 27 openly protected liquor shops on condition of their paying certain stipulated sums of money at stated intervals; 34 allowed joints to run through "apparent collusion on the part of public officers"; and 40, or less than one-third of the whole, appeared to have no such places running. More than two-thirds of the towns ignore the violation of the law; nearly half of these openly exacting and receiving revenue from the unlawful traffic.

Topeka, the capital city of the State, with a high class of people, seventy-five per cent of whom are in favor of a rigid enforcement of our liquor laws, has had to bear with from fifty to sixty joints regularly running for years past; and the police officers know the exact location and manager of every one of them. At a mass-meeting in Topeka, held on February 10, 1901, the chief of police read a long list of "well-known joints" then operating in the city, which, for one cause or other, he had been unable to close, although most of their managers had been arrested many times, and as often had gone back to their bars immediately after giving bond to appear at some convenient time. Things have gone so far that in many parts of the State good people who demand the enforcement of the law and cannot secure it through the regularly constituted officers are in quasi rebellion. Trouble is brewing. What is to be done about it?

There is only one opinion among our people about the proper way to execute this law, and that has long been written out plainly in our statutes. But politicians and joint-keepers are in the saddle. They have for years defeated the execution of this law; and in the larger cities, especially, the people seem to be powerless under the present régime. The law ought to be enforced, or it ought to be repealed for very shame's sake. When people are unable to execute their own laws, they would be better off without law, letting everybody take care of himself. But this need not be. Let the people rebel along right lines, and they will conquer.

W. A. PEPPER.

THE LIMITATIONS OF MONOPOLY.

THE power of monopoly, it is felt, must be limited, for it is quite generally believed that the unrestricted exercise of monopoly power cannot but result in social injury.

The power of monopoly is the ability to obtain some portion of the free income of society. The free income is that portion of the social income which can be diverted from one class to another without altering or disturbing the economic structure, and thus forcing a restoration of that which has been taken away. The free income of any individual is that portion of his income which he will part with, either by a decrease of his money income, or by an increase of the price of his purchases, without offering an effective resistance to this situation by ceasing to work or by changing his occupation, and so decreasing the supply and raising the price of labor in the occupation which he has quitted.

The free income is, in other words, the difference between income and standard of living. If a man's earnings are \$2.50 per day, whereas \$1.75 per day measures the present price of the goods which he considers indispensable to a comfortable and decent existence, his free income is 75 cents per day, and his total earnings can be reduced by this amount without forcing him into some new employment, and so compelling a restoration of his income.¹

This free income, in greater or less amount, inheres in the gains of every individual. There is no one whose income could not be reduced to some extent without decreasing the supply of the labor or capital which he contributes to society. The reduction in most cases could be only a small amount per day; but, in the aggregate, these millions of minute particles make up a gigantic total. Twenty-five cents from the daily income of one, fifty cents from that of another, a dollar from the gains of a third — these deductions applied to all incomes reach into the billions a year. This is the free income of society, to obtain which monopoly power is exerted. This income is absorbed through movements

¹ The connection between free income and monopoly power is original with Prof. Patten of the University of Pennsylvania.

of prices. An advance of ten per cent in the cost of living of a certain class, without a corresponding increase of its income, implies a subtraction of just this amount from its free income. This deduction can be made, for example, from the comparatively stable incomes of teachers by raising the price of gas, oil, sugar, coal, and meat, or the price of such clothing or house rent as this class is obliged to pay. This reduction of the free income of teachers, by increasing their cost of living, could go on until their incomes were so reduced that they could no longer maintain the standard of living which they should consider requisite for their position, when the supply of teaching ability offered to society would be decreased, and the money incomes of this profession would be raised until the standard of living should be restored.

Although, however, an excessive reduction of the incomes of any class can be thus prevented by a reduction of supply and a consequent rise in the value of their services or commodities, still this purely negative resistance can do no more than merely to protect the standard of living. It can do nothing to save the free income, every dollar of which can be extorted by superior monopoly power without deranging in any way the economic structure or disturbing the relations between the productive factors. Some more active resistance is required if the free income of any class is to be retained.

The power of monopoly to control prices is exerted by the limitation of supply. The more perfect and absolute is this control of supply exercised by any economic group, compared with the control exercised over the supply of their salable goods by the economic groups which exchange with it, the larger is the amount of the free income which it is able to secure as its monopoly gains. The power of a monopoly is measured by the amount of free income which is secured to the factor in question by its control of the supply. In this view of the case monopoly power is well-nigh universal. There are but few classes of society, nay, rather, few individuals in any class, who have not been able to get and to keep some portion of the social surplus. There is no class which has been reduced to a bare standard of living; and although large numbers within a class may be for a time forced down to that low level, the depression is seldom permanent.

We may now see clearly the nature of the monopoly problem. Certain classes in the community have obtained more of the free income than the amount to which an equal division would entitle them. This they have obtained through the larger control which they exert over supply, that is to say, through their superior monopoly power. We are,

for the present, concerned with the various industrial combinations against which the charge of monopoly is most frequently brought — although, to speak the truth, a skilled physician or an expert lawyer is, in his smaller way, as much a monopolist as the veriest trust of them all. The American Sugar Refining Company, or the American Tobacco Company, or the Standard Oil Company obtains an unfair advantage over Michael Hertzka, coal-miner, because it can exercise a larger control over the supply of its commodities than Michael Hertzka can exert over the supply of his labor, and can, therefore, maintain a higher net income from selling sugar, tobacco, or petroleum than Hertzka can obtain from selling his labor.

In times of depression, when the social purchasing power is reduced, the great companies can reduce their output, and maintain the price of their products at a higher level than the price of the labor of the coal-miner, which may, at such a time, entirely vanish. In the same way, when prosperity returns, and the social income increases, the price of sugar, tobacco, and oil rises much more quickly and much higher than the wages of the coal-miner. In this way, by their superior control over supply, the industrial combinations take from the laborer, the farmer, the small artisan, the man on a salary — from every one whose control over the supply of labor or goods is less absolute than theirs — a part of the free income which these factors would obtain but for the fact that, as compared with the trusts, their control over the supply is feeble and ineffective.

This, then, is the problem of monopoly. How may the monopoly power of the weak be increased and the monopoly power of the strong be diminished to an approximate equality of advantage? How, to put it in another way, may a more equal division of the social income between the different factors be accomplished?

It has been proposed that this equalization of economic advantage might be accomplished through public regulation, taxation, public ownership of the means of transportation, public commissions with inquisitorial power, and even social ostracism — to be inflicted upon the individual who attempts by the exercise of monopoly power to oppress his fellow-men. Indeed, the regulation of monopoly is the economic fad of to-day. By those whom experience has taught to distrust the revolutionary zeal of misguided enthusiasm, and who, notwithstanding, believe that the power of monopoly is at present too great, it may be asked: Are there no influences and tendencies inherent in the economic constitution of things which will curb and check the power of monopoly to control prices without invoking the blundering aid of legislation?

Current dogmatism has pointed to a safe and familiar way of escape. The industrial combinations are themselves exposed, it is said, to great dangers. If they raise prices above the competitive level they are threatened with competition. The present situation of the American Steel and Wire Company is an example. Eighteen months ago it controlled the supply of rods in the United States; the capacity of its mills representing the entire rod capacity of the United States with a figure of annual output of 1,500,000 tons. Relying upon this advantage it raised prices. Competition at once arose. At the beginning of the present year the capacity of the rod mills, built or building to compete with the Rod Trust, was 900,000 tons. Even the Standard Oil Company is attacked, and the Sugar Trust has fallen on the evil days of competition. No trust or combination, it is roundly asserted, can arbitrarily raise prices without inviting competition, and so courting destruction. We may rely upon it, we are told, that the shrewd managers of large enterprises will discover this fact for themselves, and will not tempt Providence by the practice of unjustifiable extortion upon the consumer. The consumer, therefore, in the long run, is safe.

This conclusion is unwarranted. In so far as the trusts control the sources of raw material they are in little danger from competition less favorably circumstanced. It is a familiar fact that this control has passed into their hands. The various combinations in the iron and steel industry, with hardly an exception, own their iron mines and coal mines; most of them, in some measure at least, control their own means of transportation. They are economic units, each complete within itself. Competition has small chance of carrying positions so well fortified. Secure behind their fortifications of mines, boats, and railroads, the iron trusts can defy competition. They can sell at low prices until their competitors are starved out, or until a price of purchase is agreed upon; and out of the various profits on production and transportation they can still keep up earnings to a decent figure, although the selling price of the product may fall below the actual cost of production of their would-be competitors.

All combinations, it is true, have not this advantage. The American Tobacco Company and the American Linseed Oil Company cannot own the land on which their raw material is grown, nor can the Standard Oil Company control the oil lands of the entire country; but there is always the advantage of large capital, the help of powerful financial and railway connections, and the inducements of a high purchase price to deal with bothersome competition. The American Steel and Wire

Company, for example, is reputed to have already arranged for the purchase of some of the independent plants, most of which, as is well known, were built to sell; and the Standard Oil Company, through its railway connection, for several years blocked the efforts of the Pure Oil Company to get a pipe line through to the sea-board. The line went to a railway track in New Jersey, but it could go no farther. The frequency with which the problem of competition has been solved by the purchase of a controlling interest in the competitor is seen in the institution by this same Pure Oil Company of a voting trust whose object is professedly to secure the control of the company to its present stockholders, and to guard against its purchase by the Standard Oil Company.

How easily, by way of further illustration, has the Eastern Trunk Line competition been arranged. The Pennsylvania Railroad now owns a sufficient interest in its former competitors — the Baltimore & Ohio, Chesapeake & Ohio, and Norfolk & Western — to secure it against their competition. Water competition is no more secure.

Competition between the trusts themselves no one can expect will be permanent; and this conclusion is enforced by recent events in the iron and steel industry; for large earnings depend upon a speedy settlement of all such difficulties. There is no private competition with any large combination of capital which can be relied on to impose effective limits upon its monopoly power. Such competition will be settled by intimidation, purchase, or amicable arrangement. So long as people do business for profit, some one of these means of defence will not be found wanting whenever competition seriously threatens the profits of monopoly. More effective restraints and limitations must be found, if the power of monopoly is to be controlled. Such restraints are, however, already in operation. They are: (1) The extension of the principle of combination to include every industry and all occupations — the universalization of the tendency to consolidation; and (2) the substitution of one good for another, meeting an advance in price by a change in the direction of demand.

The trust movement of the last three years, which has consolidated the industries of mining and manufacturing, should not be deplored as a social disaster. It should be hailed rather as a social gain, for it has meant a closer approach to an equality of monopoly power. Take the iron and steel industry, for example. For years the Carnegie Company dominated the situation. Other companies paid to the Carnegie Company a heavy tribute in the purchase price of their raw materials. Beginning with 1898, the plants in every branch of iron and steel produc-

tion have been consolidated. Most of these companies now controlled to some extent their supplies of raw material, a control often extending, as above stated, to the ownership of iron and coal mines, boats and railroads. They were now in a position to contend with the Carnegie Company on more equal terms, and to force from that company a large part of its monopoly advantage. The recently threatened entrance of the Carnegie Company into the business of pipe and sheet production was due to the fact that the demand for its output had been reduced by the fact that the sheet trust and the tube trust were ready to produce the greater part of the raw material which they formerly purchased from the Carnegie Company. The monopoly power of the iron and steel trade is to-day more widely diffused and more evenly distributed as a result of the iron and steel consolidations. The absorption of the principal iron and steel combinations into the United States Steel Corporation is a practical recognition of the substantial equality, in respect of monopoly power, of all iron and steel producers.

In every line of mining and manufacture, before the inception of the trust movement, firms and companies were to be found widely differing in their capacity for economical production. The stronger concerns with the best plants and the latest improvements enjoyed a considerable advantage over their weaker competitors. Charging the same price, they were able, through their lower cost of production, to make a larger profit, in short, to get to themselves a disproportionate share of such monopoly profits as accrued to the industry to which they belonged. The inclusion of all these plants, both small and great, under the consolidation of the trust, has tended to equalize this advantage and to distribute more widely the increment of monopoly gains. The growth of industrial combination, so far from concentrating, has more widely diffused the power of monopoly, and has equalized the economic advantages which arise from its possession. Producers who were formerly sufferers from monopoly power have now been permanently relieved. They have been taken into the inner circle, and have been admitted to a share in monopoly power which under the régime of free competition they could not have obtained.

It may be contended, however, that the gains to producers from the organization of the trusts have been offset by the losses which the consumers have suffered. On the one side stand the manufacturers and mine-owners, a comparatively small body, firmly organized into large consolidations. On the other side are found the workingmen, the farmers, and the professional men — ninety-nine out of every hundred of the pop-

ulation. These are the consumers, and it is from them that the social surplus is extorted. Here, it is claimed, is the real menace of the trust.

The consumer, however, has other safeguards against the power of monopoly. Owing to the corporate form which all industries have now assumed, and to the growth of the investment habit, he may, as a stockholder, participate in the monopoly gains from which as a consumer he may suffer. The wide diffusion of corporation securities is a phenomenon whose existence is not generally known, but which comes to the surface in an unmistakable way whenever hostile legislation threatens corporate profits. In Philadelphia, for example, it is estimated that fully 50,000 voters are stockholders in the municipal monopolies of that city. Probably one-fourth of the people of Philadelphia are directly interested in the monopoly profits to which, as consumers, they contribute. This same policy has long been pursued by the railroads, which have been materially assisted by the savings-fund institutions, particularly in the State of New York, where savings banks and trust companies are allowed to invest their funds in approved corporation securities. The Pittsburg Consolidated Coal Company recently made a move in the same direction, by opening to its employees an opportunity to invest in its preferred stock on exceptionally favorable terms.

The advocates of municipal and State socialism would do well to look about them. While they advocate the ownership of natural monopolies by the people, the people have already in their individual capacity taken possession. This movement toward public ownership—for such in fact it is—will progress with the general increase in incomes; and in this way the gains of monopoly will be diffused among an ever-widening circle of shareholders. Again must the trust movement be commended; because, by bringing all manufacturing industry into the corporate form, and hence imparting to its future a strength and stability which isolated heterogeneity would never have allowed, it has admitted the whole people to share in monopoly profits. As consumers, their free income may be taken from them in the price of commodities; but this is straightway handed back to them in the form of dividends.

Not only as shareholders in existing monopolies may the consumers be compensated for the loss of their free income, but as producers they may form organizations to dispute for its possession, and force a more equal division. The possibilities of consolidation are almost infinite. What is a labor union but a minute trust, and what but the stupidity of the working classes, which is now disappearing, hinders the universal organization of labor?

With the astonishing success of the United Mine Workers fresh in our memory, a victory which was won literally by force and arms, where the strongest monopoly in the United States was forced to surrender to the leader of 150,000 laboring men, with the far-reaching plans of that organization already laid before us, plans whose mere enunciation throws the coal interests into spasms of anxiety, it is an easy feat for the imagination to picture all laborers organized into colossal trusts; wielding not only the power of monopoly, but the power of the ballot; wisely guided by men who have taken the motto "Live and let live" as the controlling principle of their management, and easily, without a struggle, enforcing an even division with their employers. In view of this gigantic movement, which has already assumed such formidable proportions, why need the laboring man fear the power of monopoly? He may himself, by the simple process of organization, become the strongest monopolist of them all. Here, again, the people should be grateful to the trust for having so clearly pointed the way to general consolidation of all producers.

Nor is the farmer prevented from a share in the advantages of centralized industry. The nation has often, during the past twenty years, been congratulated upon the fact that agriculture could not be brought under the trust form of organization. If this were, indeed, the case the farmer should be pitied. With manufacturing and mining industries in firm control of his products, he would, indeed, be at an alarming disadvantage were such control to be denied to him. Such, however, is not the case. Signs unmistakable point to the approaching centralization of agricultural industry.

The fruit-growers of California have been, for several years, acting together. The California Cured Fruit Association owns its own cars, makes its own terms with the transporting companies, and carefully limits supplies to market requirements. A recent illustration of the power of this organization is seen in its reduction of the middle-men's profits in the prune trade. Until recently a pound of prunes which sold for four cents on the car brought twelve cents by the time it reached the consumer. The Association has recently notified the trade that hereafter prunes will be delivered in sealed packages, with the price marked thereon, and that these packages are not to be broken by the dealer. The fruit-growers of North Carolina have gone even further than this. They propose to deal directly with the consumers through the agents of their organization. Another illustration of the centralization of the agricultural industry is seen in the organization of a company to purchase the rice crop of Louisiana and eastern Texas. Seventy-five per cent of the

growers have signed contracts to deliver their crop at the warehouses of the company, at a stated price, for the term of four years. The price obtained is higher than that which prevailed when the farmer was at the mercy of the middle-man.

These are only a few of many illustrations which could be given of the spread of the trust movement into the agricultural industry. There is no reason to doubt that the movement will go on until it includes the growers of cotton, meat, and cereals. The Granger movement of the seventies broke down because the farmer had not learned the lesson of self-control and subordination to his chosen representatives. The economic basis of the movement was entirely sound. There is no reason why the wheat-growers should not sell their grain to their own association, which could carry it for a favorable market with money borrowed on its security. This is what the elevator companies do at present. The farmers' associations could do it equally well. Those who deny the feasibility of the centralization of agriculture must also deny that the growth of general intelligence among farmers, and the keenness of insight into industrial conditions which the farmer proverbially possesses, will not be sufficient, in the near future, to influence these people in discerning the signs of the times, and in following the example of the labor unions in securing a larger control over the supply of their product.

There is no need to follow the movement into other lines, and show that the spirit of centralization has already infected all branches of wholesale and retail trade; that the business of banking and exchange is following in the same direction, and that even the professional classes are catching the spirit of the age.

The universalization of monopoly power, and, by consequence, a closer approach to equality of monopoly advantage, is already in sight. When all producers are closely organized the supply of every commodity will be firmly controlled. What is taken from the laboring man in the price of oil, sugar, and coffee, will be restored to him in a higher rate of wages. What the farmer loses in the price of barbed wire and binding-twine will be restored to him in the price of wheat. When all the productive factors stand on an equal footing, no one will be able to gain any considerable advantage over any other. This monopoly power will never be equally distributed. To expect this would be visionary. But conclusive evidence, accumulating on every hand and in every industry, points to the conclusion that the solution of the problem of monopoly lies not in the abolition or even the curtailment of monopoly power, but in its general distribution throughout all classes of society.

But the consumer need not rely solely upon these means of protection against the power of monopoly. He has a more effective remedy constantly at hand, in the power of substitution — a remedy whose application, though requiring a modicum of intelligence, is instantly effective. The sympathetic movement of prices has long been clearly perceived. The prices of wheat, corn, and oats move together, no matter in which grain the initial disturbance of the supply-and-demand relation may have occurred. The prices of all products which are interchangeable in their uses rise and fall in unison.

The application of this law of the sympathetic price movements of substitutes has not been made to the problem of monopoly, yet its application is plain and obvious. Let us proceed by illustration. The monopoly of the anthracite-coal industry has been already referred to. From 1880 to 1898, while general prices fell forty per cent, the price of anthracite coal at Philadelphia declined from \$4.53 to \$3.75, or seventeen per cent. The consumer was taxed more and more heavily by the coal trust. How did he escape from this situation? By the use of bituminous coal. The almost unlimited area of soft-coal land enabled the supply to be increased at will. During this same period, 1880 to 1898, the price of bituminous coal in the United States decreased from \$3.75 to \$1.60 per ton, or sixty per cent, the result of an increase in its supply from 38,200,000 tons in 1880 to 148,700,000 tons in 1898 — an increase in per-capita consumption of from .76 tons in 1880 to 2 tons in 1898. During the same period the production of anthracite coal increased only from 25,500,000 tons in 1880 to 47,600,000 tons in 1898, an increase in per-capita consumption of from .5 ton in 1880 to .6 ton in 1898, or twenty per cent, as compared with an increase in the per-capita consumption of bituminous coal of 163 per cent.

In other words, during this period of eighteen years, the per-capita consumption of bituminous coal increased eight times as rapidly as the consumption of anthracite. A constantly increasing proportion of the population have abandoned or decreased their consumption of the monopolized fuel in favor of a cheaper substitute. Along the same line have come the substitution of crushed coke for anthracite coal, and the use of gas and petroleum as fuel. No better illustration of the effectiveness of the power of substitution to curb the power of monopoly could be asked for.

The Standard Oil Company is a monopoly. It has almost absolute control over the price of refined petroleum, and can fix its price at the point of largest monopoly revenue. But this power can only be exer-

cised to the fullest extent in the country and in the smaller towns. On approaching a gas tank or an electric-light plant the price of oil at once declines. The general substitution of gas for oil depends merely on the continuance of the growth of towns into cities and of hamlets into towns. Soft coal is everywhere abundant, and gas can be manufactured at a low price. A few companies, like the United Gas Improvement Company of Philadelphia, have consciously adopted this policy of substitution, and are rapidly introducing gas as a substitute for anthracite coal and petroleum.

The International Paper Company announced in its prospectus that its monopoly was secured by the possession of large tracts of timber land in Canada and northern Maine. Its position, therefore, in the statement of the prospectus and in the opinion of the trade, was invulnerable. Hardly, however, had the publisher felt the first pinch of monopoly, when substitutes for the raw material were discovered. The magnolia-tree, which will grow anywhere in the lowlands of the South, furnishes a grade of wood pulp which is entirely satisfactory. Furthermore, the announcement is made and confirmed that paper pulp from the hull of the cotton-seed and from the waste of the sugar plantation can also be made. The monopoly of the International Paper Company is in great danger from these cheaper substitutes.

Examples of the power of substitution could be indefinitely multiplied. Cotton-seed oil has been successfully degummed, and is being sold in competition with linseed oil, the control of whose supply has given to the American Linseed Oil Company its control of the paint market. Moreover, cold-water paint, a mixture of lime, water, and casein, is being sold for the same purpose, making a satisfactory substitute. The price of wool is a monopoly price, from whose incidence there seemed to be no way of escape; yet a recent estimate of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers states that the per-capita consumption of wool in the grease has decreased from 9.07 pounds in 1890 to 6.7 pounds in 1900, a result due to the substitution of cotton. A substitute has been discovered for rubber. Ramie has been decorticated and will soon serve as a substitute for flax. The monopoly of the copper trust is threatened by the solution of the problem of leaching copper direct from the ore, without the long and expensive operations of roasting and smelting, which confine production to a comparatively small area of high-grade ores easy to be controlled.

There is no need of further illustration. No monopoly is secure in its control; for no monopoly can be protected against the power of sub-

stitution. Until bounds are set to the power of invention, and until the possibilities of natural resources are strictly limited, we can never be in serious danger from the tax of monopoly prices. It is true that the exercise of this power of substitution implies a degree of discernment not generally possessed up to this time; but the rapid introduction of substitutes within the last few years, among all classes of consumers, and the fact that many of these substitutes exert their influence upon prices in the field of capital goods, where the people are trained to discover and appreciate them, assure us that the general limitation of the power of monopoly by the power of substitution will not be long delayed.

EDWARD SHERWOOD MEADE.

THE CASE FOR THE SOUTH.

MY subject, and, sadly, my purpose, may be hackneyed. Nevertheless, it is plain that, despite all that has been said and done, even the best of men and women in the North have not yet arrived at the point of insight and knowledge of conditions essential to real sympathy with their fellow-citizens of the Southern States. I fear that the average Northerner is at best indifferent, and that there are those who regard the Southern people, in politics at any rate, with something akin to scorn. Once more, then, let me present the case for the South as an appeal to the sympathy, the patriotism, and the common sense of the North.

I confess that I am prompted to the writing of this article by the result of the recent election — seeing that for two years surely, for several more probably, the affairs of our nation are to be in the hands of the Republican party, in which obviously there is scant sympathy with the South — and by certain movements in Congress. I lay no charge against the party. It were too much to expect that, having so few representatives of the South in its official ranks, and having received a steadfast opposition from the South from the beginning, the Republican party should sympathize with the Southern people or in the slightest degree appreciate their point of view. Without irony, however, let me interject that a party that has done so much to make the South a part of the Union owes it to itself to regard the Southern people as of one common country, and to be concerned for them as zealously as for those of faithful New England.

Now let me point out some more or less familiar facts. The Southern people are a conquered people. They fought to the bitter end. But history contains nothing to surpass the nobility with which they have conducted themselves since 1865. The soldiers of Lee lived to become, with whole hearts, citizens of our common country; and, without exception, they have reared their sons and daughters to love the Union. The Confederacy is but a memory. There is not the remotest vestige of the passion that swept the male population of our section against the North: there is a natural, unrestrained love for our common country. We honor

the Confederate veteran, we glory in his valor, we cherish the fame of leaders lost; but of actual feeling against the Union there is not, I repeat, the remotest vestige. One born since the war finds it almost impossible to realize that the war occurred; and the records of its bitterness and intensity can scarcely be believed.

Children of ease, softened by a stately civilization, unused to labor, the Southern people found themselves at the close of the war confronted with conditions that would have destroyed them, had it been possible — labor gone, property gone, lands run down, currency abolished, male population sadly reduced, national hopes utterly wrecked. The oft-portrayed spectacle of the Southern soldier with armless sleeve returning to find his home in ruins and desolation can never be half drawn. That picture is not of one man, but of tens of thousands. All this represents only the background. Had there been no more than this, the New South would have arisen from the ashes long ago. But hear me.

Confronting that soldier was a mass of freed negroes, unversed in government, susceptible to every kind of darkness, yet invested with the high prerogatives of Anglo-Saxon self-sovereignty and cooperative government. There were 4,000,000 of them, all told, 850,000 of them voters! But this is not the worst of it. The former master might have instructed his one-time slave. But from the North came another army of invasion, camp-followers and adventurers, in the name of Reconstruction, who — destroyers that they were, as unworthy of the North as the South — filled the hearts of the negroes with a bitterness and a suspicion of their former masters that had not been known before. If the North wonders why the white is against the black let it read history and learn that sons of the North first set the black man's heart against the white man.

Out of these circumstances has come the solid South — a sectional protest against sectional passion. It is only thirty-five years since; but one may reckon it a hundred when he sees the changed conditions. The stately antebellum civilization passed, not to return; the country estate is known no more; the very atmosphere has passed away. Here is a prosperous people, quite as happy as that other day knew; here are thriving cities where once were only court-houses; here are thousands of small, but busy, farms where there were hundreds of greater and more idle ones; here is a social life quite as hearty, if not so aristocratic, as that of slavery times; here are manufacturing enterprises in ever-increasing numbers where formerly the thrill of industrial enterprise was never known; here, in brief, is as hopeful a people as the sun shines on.

The Southern people have come to this through agonies of poverty;

and, though they were compelled by necessity to work on the credit system and to purchase from other sections, they have paid for every thing they have almost twice over. It is a tribute not more to the productiveness of their lands than to their industry and the courage of their hearts. They have reared churches and schools everywhere; they have built cities, railroads, and factories; and, at present, with a population schooled in adversity at last come into the borderland of prosperity, they are charged with the thrill of an industrial impulse that will astonish their Northern brothers long before it shall have spent its force.

The Southern people were not long perplexed with the difficulty of commercial and social readjustment. Energy and labor and self-respect were required; and these could not be destroyed. But the South struggles yet with her political problem, thrust upon her by that greatest of civil blunders, the enfranchisement of a numerous host of ignorant men of a lower race, who were incapable of the ballot, and who, it is unreasonable to hope, can be made fit for its responsibilities within two hundred years. The most deplorable effect of the war was not the loss of slaves, for from the day of surrender until now negro labor has been as cheap as it was in slavery; not the loss of money, not the loss of hope — all these have been overcome, and in their stead we have real blessings — but the enfranchisement of the negroes. If the negroes in North Carolina have a more constant friend than myself, if they have a friend who has spoken more frequently in their behalf these last two turbulent years, it is not because he has excelled me in zeal for their welfare or in appreciation of their potential virtues. I do not mean to say that we would have had a perfect civilization but for the enfranchisement of the negroes, or that the negroes have been intentional authors of our woes. I simply mean that the presence of the solid negro vote — in vast majority in many districts and in some entire States — has presented, perhaps, the most serious evil that could have confronted the South.

The Southern white people have had to stand together in politics. No matter into what condition their party might fall, no matter what it might do, no matter who should lead it, they have had to vote all one way or give over large sections to the rule of negroes — which, men of the North, surely meant corruption and anarchy. The negro cannot rule, whatever else he may be capable of. Here is a case in point. In one Congressional district in North Carolina, Mr. McKinley appointed eighteen selected negroes to federal positions. In three years, five of them were arrested for robbing the mails.

It is not a matter of prejudice in the South, but one of incontrovertible fact, that it is the exception and not the rule when negroes are found

capable of responsible position of trust. That there are such negroes is a blessed fact; but they are not in politics. The very nature of Southern — and, I hear, Northern — politics in all parties is corrupting; and if the white man finds it difficult to resist temptation, we can scarcely expect the negro, whose conscience has not been long under the tutelage of independence, to withstand it. So, then, as between municipal carelessness, boss-rule, partisan laws, and passionate politics, on one hand, and municipal carelessness, boss-rule, partisan laws, and passionate politics, plus negro incompetence, weakness, and insolence, on the other — the Southern people have chosen to have the former when they must; and I make haste to say that it has not always been necessary, not by any means. North Carolina has had many a year of good government, and so have other Southern States. The point is, though, that the negro has made corruption ever near at hand and kept us powerless against it. Of course, it is obvious that, exerting such an influence, the negro vote has made political progress very tedious. Reforms and more timely laws have come tardily, lest their suddenness might divide the white vote.

These are some of the conditions. It is clear that to Southerners the one insurmountable obstacle to progress politically has been the presence of a large body of negro voters, ignorant and irretrievably prejudiced. Having overcome in every other respect the consequences of the Civil War, within the last ten years the Southern people have made bold to devise means of overcoming this difficulty. Let the reader put this to their credit, no matter what he thinks about it: their motive is good. And I have an idea that the Southern people have some advantages over the Northern politicians in this matter. They have lived here and dealt with this problem for thirty-five years. This is the point I wish to impress particularly.

I would not undertake to deny the fact that in the "black" districts there have been for years various irregular methods of cutting down the negro majorities. But what reasonable man will not at least appreciate the animus of the white citizen who, having to choose between defrauding the negroes of the suffrage and turning a county over to them and to anarchy, between cheating or intimidating the negroes and abandoning his home and property, has chosen the former? Of course, this has brought the suffrage low. Of course, it was inevitable that the ballot-box should fall into the hands of bad men, under such circumstances. Of course, such conditions tend to prostrate the people morally. Southern citizens have known this. And here is the word for the Northern reader: Out of reflection upon this condition and its one cause, the Southern States have these ten years been following one another in measures de-

signed to eliminate the negro vote legally. Is not the motive good? Would the noblest citizen in Massachusetts do less?

It is this view that I desire to get before the citizens of the North. I declare that the amendment to the constitution of North Carolina disfranchising the negroes was ratified, not in prejudice against the negro, not for any party's sake, but for honesty's sake, to save the State from moral prostration, to save the people from political slavery, in the bondage of fear. If the Republicans could only see that this elimination is the only hope of their party in the South! In the recent election the majority for Mr. Bryan in North Carolina was about 25,000. Of this majority fully three-fourths was "rolled up" in the black districts, where the negroes did not vote. The two districts in which white people are in the largest proportion elected Republican Congressmen by handsome majorities. This indicates the evenness of political chances where there is liberty of choice. Since our Suffrage Amendment was ratified there has been far more freedom of expression. And on every hand there is a demand for a fair election law, for better schools, and for progressive legislation; and there is good earnest that this demand will be heard. As I write these words our General Assembly is passing a bill appropriating \$200,000 extra to our public school fund; and I am enabled to say that a fair election law has been agreed upon.

If, however, these measures of elimination are interfered with, my word for it the South is all but hopeless politically, unless other legal means may be found. For if legal means may not be, illegal methods will prevail by common consent, against which no power that I know of may successfully cope. Force bills and soldiery might be offered. I hesitate to contemplate the effect of such measures. I prefer to hope that statesmen will take counsel before giving any section of our land over to the negroes, who by every token of experience and reason are unfit not only to bear office, but to vote. To a Southern man, in the light of common observation, it is a constant wonder that any one ever ventured to hope that a million slaves could reach the point of Anglo-Saxon self-sovereignty in a day or a decade or a century. And in view of General Wood's experience in Cuba and Mr. Dole's in Hawaii, not to mention the Philippines, he takes hope that his Northern brethren will at last appreciate the South's long struggles against great odds, up from desolation, under a handicap like which no people ever bore before.

The South is in the morning of a new day. Her mines, her forests, her fields, and her factories have begun to attract the tide of population. The latest census indicates that her population has increased by a larger

percentage than that of the West. The new régime in Cuba and the opening of our Isthmian canal will enlarge her market. By manufacturing her own cotton she will easily increase her annual income 300 per cent. Her industrial life is fast becoming like that of the North, and her political sympathies will surely tend the same way — but not if the party in power strikes down her arm as she raises it to free herself.

The population of the South is homogeneous. The foreigner is a stranger here. The Southern people are sons of those first pioneers who came from England and Scotland, and, in the farther South, from Spain and France. In other days the South played a great part in national life. Not a few of the nation's great leaders came from below Mason and Dixon's line. If these last thirty-five years have not brought forth one man of the first rank the reason is plain. Her political condition has rendered it impossible. Let no one fancy that the potential blood is not here. It is here, if anywhere; and a few years, if the South's determined effort to free her sons is appreciated, will bring forth rich contributions to the glory of our nation.

So, then, I submit that it is good statesmanship to leave the South to her own way in working out her salvation from the ignorant negro vote. If her plans shall be proved unconstitutional, I submit that it would be better to abrogate the Fourteenth Amendment than to drive her back into the wilderness. I submit that it is good political policy. I hold no brief for any party; but I say what Democrats and Republicans in the South all know when I declare that the only hope of the Republican party and of political progress in the South lies in the elimination of the ignorant negro from the voting body. Republican victory by means of the negro vote will never bring the right stamp of men into its councils; nor will it be on a permanent basis. But there will not be any Republican victory of consequence so long as the negro is suffered to vote.

I submit that the interests of all parts of our country are largely identical. If the South is paralyzed the North must suffer. In this new time, when our nation must confront the world, we must make the most possible of the whole nation, and we must make it whole. Thus, the Republican party in full power is confronted with alluring opportunities of constructive statesmanship, second to none in our political history. I appeal to the men of the North to allow their Southern brethren to determine the means of dealing with the negro vote. In all else the Southern people have recovered from the war. In this they can recover, if permitted to follow the impulses arising from moral and political necessity, and from the dictates of long experience.

JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY.

THE GRANGE.

THE difficulty of uniting the farmers of America for any form of co-operative endeavor long ago became proverbial. The business of farming encouraged individualism; comparative isolation bred independence; and restricted means of communication made union physically difficult, even among those who might be disposed to unite. It was not strange, therefore, that the agricultural masses grew into a state of mind unfavorable for organization—that they became suspicious of one another, jealous of leadership, unwilling to keep the pledges of union, and unable to sink personal views and prejudices.

It must not be supposed, however, that the farmers themselves have failed to realize the situation, or that no genuinely progressive steps have been taken to remedy it. During the last three decades at least, the strongest men that the rural classes have produced have labored with their fellows, both in season and out of season, for union of effort; and their efforts have been by no means in vain. It is true that some of the attempts at co-operation have been ill-judged, even fantastic. It is true that much of the machinery of organization failed to work and can be found on the social junk-pile, in company with other discarded implements not wholly rural in origin. But it is also true that great progress has been made; that the spirit of co-operation is rapidly emerging as a factor in rural social life; and that the weapons of rural organization have a temper all the better, perhaps, because they were fashioned on the anvil of defeat.

Among all these efforts to unite the farming classes, by far the most characteristic and the most successful is the Grange. The truth of this statement will be immediately questioned by those whose memory recalls the early rush to the Grange, "Granger legislation," and similar phenomena, as well as by those whose impressions have been gleaned from reading the periodicals of the late seventies, when the Grange tide had begun to ebb. Indeed, it seems to be the popular impression that the Grange is not at present a force of consequence, that long ago it became a cripple, if not a corpse. Only a few years ago, an intelligent magazine writer, in

discussing the subject of farmers' organizations, made the statement, "The Grange is dead." But the assertion was not true. The popular impression must be revised. The Grange has accomplished more for agriculture than has any other farm organization. Not only is it at the present time active, but it has more real influence than it has ever had before; and it approaches nearer to a national farmers' organization than any thing else in existence to-day.

The Grange is also the oldest of the general organizations for farmers. Though the notion of organizing the farmers was undoubtedly broached early in the history of the country, the germ idea that actually grew into the Grange is about a third of a century old, and should be credited to Mr. O. H. Kelley, a Boston young man who settled on a Minnesota farm in 1849. He wrote considerably for the agricultural press; and this experience helped to bring him to the conclusion that the great need of agriculture was the education of the agriculturist. He soon came to feel that existing agencies for this purpose — farm papers and fairs — were insufficient. In 1866, as agent for the Department of Agriculture, Mr. Kelley made a tour of the South, with the view of gaining a knowledge of the agricultural and mineral resources of that section. On this tour he became impressed with the fact that politicians would never restore peace to the country; that if it came at all, it would have to come through fraternity. As his thought ripened he broached to friends the idea of a "secret society of agriculturists, as an element to restore kindly feelings among the people."

Thus the Grange was born of two needs, one fundamental and the other immediate. The fundamental need of agriculture was that farmers should be better educated for their business; and the immediate need was that of cultivating the spirit of brotherhood between the North and the South. The latter need was unquestionably a powerful factor in the destruction of the sectional spirit, and no longer exists; but the fundamental need still remains and is sufficient excuse for the Grange's existence to-day. Mr. Kelley interested six other men in the new idea; and in December, 1867, these "seven founders of the Order" organized the National Grange of Patrons of Husbandry. Two of these founders still live — Mr. Kelley, in Florida, and Dr. John Trimble, the revered secretary of the National Grange, in Washington, D. C.

Thus was begun a movement for organization that had resulted by 1873 in the formation of over 20,000 Granges in 28 States, comprising not less than 750,000 members; and in that year the National Grange, as a representative body, was officially organized. For four or five years

this unexampled prosperity continued ; then the reports show a feeling of weakness creeping in. In fact, the Order as a whole steadily declined in numbers and prestige during the whole of the decade following 1880. The losses were most serious, however, in the South and West; for in New England and the Middle States it retained its vitality, and, indeed, grew steadily.

During the last ten years there has been a widespread revival of interest in the organization, and the outlook is exceedingly promising. Since 1890 the membership has increased not less than seventy-five per cent. New York at present has 550 Subordinate Granges, with 43,000 members; Pennsylvania, 526 Granges and 20,000 members; Maine, 275 Granges and 29,000 members; New Hampshire, 260 Granges and 24,000 members; Michigan, 420 Granges and nearly 25,000 members. These States lead, but the Order is also active and strong in Vermont, Connecticut, Ohio, Massachusetts. Thirty States pay dues to the National Grange treasury, and twenty-four were represented by delegates at the last National Grange.

The official title of the Grange is "Patrons of Husbandry," of the members "Patrons," and of the various divisions "Granges." The "Subordinate Grange," or local lodge, is the Grange unit. Its area of jurisdiction has, nominally, a diameter of about five miles; more roughly, "a Grange to a township" is the working ideal among the organizers. The membership consists of men and women, and of young people over fourteen years of age, who may apply and by vote be accepted. Constitutionally, those whose interests are not immediately with agriculture are ineligible to membership; and care is also exercised that only those who are of good repute shall be recommended. The presiding officer of each Grange is the "Master"; while among the twelve other officers the "Lecturer" is the most important, and virtually acts as programme committee, with charge of the educational work of the body. Meetings are held weekly or fortnightly. Each regular meeting has first its business session, and then its "Lecturer's hour," or literary session, usually with an intervening recess for social greetings, etc. The programmes are prepared by the Lecturer, and consist of general discussions, essays, talks, debates, readings, recitations, and music; an attempt being made to suit the tastes and talents of all members, young and old. Many Granges have built and own their halls, these being usually equipped with kitchen and dining-room, in addition to audience rooms; for periodical "feasts" are as regular a feature of the association as are the initiations of new members.

The Granges of a county or other given district often organize themselves into a "Pomona Grange." The "State Grange" is a delegate body, meeting annually; delegates being chosen by the Subordinate and Pomona Granges. The "National Grange" is composed of the Masters of State Granges and their wives, and is also an annual gathering. The National Grange is the legislative body of the Order, and has full authority in all matters of doctrine and practice. But to State Granges is left the determination of policy and administration for the States. The State Granges, in turn, legislate for the Subordinate Granges, while also passing down to them ample local powers. The machinery is thus strongly centralized, and Subordinate Granges are absolutely dependent units of a great whole. Yet the principle of home rule pervades the organization; and local associations are responsible for their own methods and the results of their work, though their officers usually work in harmony with the State and National Granges.

Perhaps the clearest conception of what the Order originally meant to do can be gained from a few quotations from the Declaration of Purposes of the National Grange, which was promulgated twenty-five years ago, and is still in force:

"We shall endeavor to advance our cause by laboring to accomplish the following objects:

"To develop a better and higher manhood and womanhood among ourselves. To enhance the comfort and attractions of our homes and to strengthen our attachments to our pursuits. To foster mutual understanding and coöperation. To maintain inviolate our laws, and to emulate each other in labor, to hasten the good time coming. To reduce our expenses, both individual and corporate. To buy less and produce more, in order to make our farms self-sustaining. To diversify our crops and crop no more than we can cultivate. To condense the weight of our exports, selling less in the bushel and more on hoof and in fleece; less in lint and more in warp and woof. To systematize our work, and calculate intelligently on probabilities. To discountenance the credit system, the mortgage system, the fashion system, and every other system tending to prodigality and bankruptcy.

"We propose meeting together, talking together, working together, buying together, selling together, and, in general, acting together for our mutual protection and advancement, as occasion may require. We shall avoid litigation as much as possible, by arbitration in the Grange. We shall constantly strive to secure entire harmony, good will, vital brotherhood, among ourselves, and to make our Order perpetual. We shall earnestly endeavor to suppress personal, local, sectional, and National prejudices, all unhealthy rivalry, all selfish ambition. Faithful adherence to these principles will insure our mental, moral, social, and material advancement.

"For our business interests we desire to bring producers and consumers, farmers and manufacturers, into the most direct and friendly relations possible. Hence we must dispense with a surplus of middle-men, not that we are unfriendly to them, but we do not need them. Their surplus and their exactions diminish our profits.

"We wage no aggressive warfare against any other interests whatever. On the contrary, all our acts and all our efforts, so far as business is concerned, are not only

for the benefit of the producer and consumer, but also for all other interests that tend to bring these two parties into speedy and economical contact. Hence we hold that transportation companies of every kind are necessary to our success, that their interests are intimately connected with our interests.

"We are opposed to such spirit and management of any corporation or enterprise as tends to oppress the people, and rob them of their just profits. We are not enemies to capital, but we oppose the tyranny of monopolies. We long to see the antagonism between capital and labor removed by common consent, and by an enlightened statesmanship worthy of the nineteenth century. We are opposed to excessive salaries, high rates of interest, and exorbitant per-cent profits in trade.

"We shall advance the cause of education among ourselves and for our children, by all just means within our power. We especially advocate for our agricultural and industrial colleges that practical agriculture, domestic science, and all the arts which adorn the home be taught in their courses of study.

"We emphatically and sincerely assert the oft-repeated truth taught in our organic law, that the Grange — National, State, or Subordinate — is not a political or party organization. No Grange, if true to its obligations, can discuss political or religious questions, or call political conventions, or nominate candidates, or even discuss their merits at its meetings.

"We always bear in mind that no one, by becoming a Patron of Husbandry, gives up that inalienable right and duty which belongs to every American citizen, to take a proper interest in the politics of his country. On the contrary, it is his duty to do all he can in his own party to put down bribery, corruption, and trickery; to see that none but competent, faithful, and honest men, who will unflinchingly stand by our industrial interests, are nominated for all positions of trust; and to have carried out the principle which should characterize every Patron, that the office should seek the man, and not the man the office."

To enumerate the achievements of the Grange would be to recall the progress of agriculture during the past quarter of a century. It has been a motor force in many helpful movements, and in many ways has organized and incorporated the best thought of the most intelligent farmers, about means for rural advancement. It has been an integral part of, and a most potent factor in, the expansion of American farm life.

The greatest achievement of the Order is that it has taught the farmers of America the value of co-operation and the power of organized effort. The lesson has not been fully learned, it is true; but the success of the institution testifies that it is possible for farmers to work in harmony. It is worth observing that this result has been achieved on conservative lines. It is comparatively easy to organize on radical lines; easy to generate enthusiasm by promising some great reform; easy to inflame self-interest by picturing millennial conditions, especially when the pocket is touched. But quite different is it to arouse and sustain interest in a large popular organization whose object is education, whose watchword is self-culture. Of course, it would be but a half-truth to assert that the Order places all its emphasis on the sober problems of education. Agitation has had its place; the hope of better things for the farmer, to be achieved through

legislation and business coöperation, has been an inspiration to activity; but the noteworthy fact remains that it has secured a fair degree of organization and coöperation among farmers chiefly by appeals to their larger and nobler interests.

That the association has vastly improved the social opportunities of farmers is a trite saying among old observers of its work. It forces isolation out of the saddle. The regular meetings of the local bodies rapidly and surely develop the social instinct among the members. Pomona Granges bring together members from all parts of the county and make them acquainted with one another. The State Grange draws its membership from every corner of the State; and as its personnel changes each year, thousands are in the course of a few years given the wider outlook, the more extended acquaintance, and the broader view that participation in such a gathering affords. Special social features add their influence.

As an educator on public questions the Grange has done a noble work. At nearly every meeting in this country, some topic of public concern is brought up by essay, talk, general discussion, or formal debate. The views of the "village Hampdens" may not always be economically scientific or scholarly. But it might surprise many people to see how well read the members are and how clearly they can express their ideas. Their discussions are not seldom informative, and that they make public opinion in rural communities is beyond cavil. The persistent advocacy of specific reforms has directed the thought of the members toward the larger issues that so often rise above the haze of partisan politics.

The Order has prepared the soil for adequate agricultural education. While the agricultural colleges have had many enemies among the farmers, and have received scornful opprobrium from those whom they were endeavoring to help, almost without exception the Granges have praised the colleges, welcomed their work, and urged farmers to educate their sons at these institutions. Farmers' Institutes, the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and the Federal Department of Agriculture have been equally welcomed by the Grange sentiment. The Grange has always taught the need of better rural education. It has also tended to develop its members, so that they may not only appreciate education, but that they may be themselves living examples of the value of such education. Farmers' Institute lecturers frequently say, "You can always tell when you reach a community where a Grange exists." In that meeting will be found men who have read and thought on farm and public themes, men who are not only ready in discussion, apt in statement, and eager to

question, but men acquainted with parliamentary law, who know how such assemblages should be conducted, and who can preside with dignity and grace.

The Order has undoubtedly aided materially in obliterating sectionalism. That achievement was one of its avowed objects. There is no question that it assisted in cementing North and South; and that it has brought East and West into closer sympathy is equally true. Other farm organizations have found their incentive in the Order. These it has never frowned on, though believing and always hoping that it might attract the majority of farmers to its own ranks, and by this unity become a more powerful factor in securing the rights and developing the opportunities of the rural classes of America. It has always discountenanced the credit system; and that cash payments by farmers to merchants are far more common than a quarter-century ago may be fairly credited, in part at least, to its influence.

To describe the many specific legislative achievements which the Granges of the nation and of the several States have accomplished would be tedious. Merely to enumerate a few of them must suffice here. A convenient summary is made from an official circular recently issued by the National Grange. The Order has had a large influence in securing the following: The separation of certain agricultural colleges from universities which were receiving the land-grant funds, but were not, in the opinion of the farmers, duly contributing to agricultural education; the confining of the appropriations under the second Morrill act of 1890 strictly to instruction in agriculture and mechanical arts; the Hatch act of 1887, establishing an experiment station in each State and Territory; making the head of the Department of Agriculture a cabinet official; the agitation resulting in the famous Iowa court decision, that railroad franchises are subject to the power that created them; the establishment of the Inter-State Commerce Commission; tax reform in many States; laws favoring pure food and dairy products; preventing extension of patents on sewing machines; the establishment of rural free mail delivery.

The methods of work are many and varied. In addition to the regular literary and social programmes previously mentioned, socials are held at the homes of members, entertainments of various kinds occur at the Grange hall, and in many ways the association becomes the centre of the social and intellectual interest of the community. It is debating society, club, lecture course, parliamentary society, theatre, and circulating library. In fact, it lends itself to almost any function that will instruct, entertain, benefit, or assist its members financially, morally, intellectually, or so-

cially. Of course, not every Grange is awake to its opportunities; but, as a rule, where a live one exists it is the acknowledged leader in social movements. The following news item, descriptive of the equipment of a strong Grange in one of the best Grange counties in the United States, will emphasize the possibilities of the organization:

"Macon Grange is one of the best-equipped Granges of the thirty-four in Lenawee County, Mich. It has a membership of 150, with a good prospective increase; is carrying \$70,000 in the Patrons' Mutual Fire Insurance Co.; has a well-furnished, commodious hall, 26x50 feet, two stories high, a dining-hall with tables and dishes for ninety at a sitting. The audience room upstairs is carpeted and well supplied with paraphernalia, bunting, etc., warmed with a furnace, and seated with 200 chairs. We have a good choir, a male quartette, an orchestra; also dramatic club. There is a nice maple grove on the lot, and 180 feet of sheds, where forty teams can be sheltered from wind and storm. We also have twenty-three miles of rural free mail delivery, and forty miles of rural telegraph, which connects the homes of nearly all the members, and is much utilized in committee work, arranging programmes, etc."

It is not uncommon for Granges to hold fairs for the exhibition of agricultural and domestic products. The State Fair of New Hampshire has been largely managed by the Grange. In many cases Granges as organizations will exhibit at the ordinary county or district fair. Picnics and field meetings are coming to be very popular in some States, these being held during the summer season, at a time when work is least pressing, and are usually attended by speakers of prominence in the Order. Many Subordinate Granges give public lecture courses during the winter, securing speakers on general themes. They also arrange for entertainments of a popular character.

The Order also participates in activities that are not strictly Grange work. For instance, in Michigan, the State Grange has for six years carried on a "Fresh-Air Work," by which over 1,000 working girls, children, and hard-working mothers with babies, from the larger cities, have been given a two-weeks' vacation in country homes. The philanthropic agencies of the cities arrange for transportation and secure the beneficiaries, while the Grange obtains the places for them. Granges are always active in the organization of Farmers' Institutes, agricultural fairs, etc. In Michigan they are assisting in the organization of associations which are designed to bring together both teachers and parents for discussion of rural school problems.

On two important matters the Grange has been much misunderstood, not only by the public, but, more unfortunately, sometimes by its own members. In his "Division and Reunion," Prof. Woodrow Wilson speaks of it under the sub-title of "New Parties." Prof. Alexander Johnston, in his "American Politics" was more discriminating, for he said of it: "In

its nature it is not political." But he also said: "Its object is co-operation among farmers, in purchasing and in other business interests." The first conception of the character of the Order is wholly misleading; the second is inadequate.

The Grange is not a party. It never was a party. During the "Granger legislation" period, many members doubtless misconceived the true function of the Grange, and abused the power organization gave them, while the popular mind credited the association with many notions for which it was not responsible. It has never organized itself as a farmers' party. The National Grange has endeavored to keep strictly aloof from partisan politics. It is possible that in some States the influence of the organization was, in the early days, used for partisan purposes; but the penalty was fully paid in the disruption of the Order in those States. The Grange to-day regards partisanship as poisonous to its life, and does not allow it on its shelves.

This is not to say that the Grange makes no appeal to legislation. It is possible that in some cases it places too much faith in law as a means of emancipation from economic bondage; but, in the main, its legislative point of view is sane and conservative. It believes that such ills as are due to bad or imperfect legislation can be, at least partly, relieved by good or more perfect legislation. Nor does it limit its interest to measures that concern the farmer alone. It is unalterably opposed to class legislation, and aims to keep its own skirts clear — to avoid even the suspicion of offence in this particular.

It may be asked, How does the Order manage to advocate public measures without becoming involved in partisan squabbles? Simply by ceasing to discuss a question the moment it becomes a party foot-ball. For instance: the financial policy of the Government was warmly discussed until the conventions of 1896 made it clear that it was to be a party issue. Again: the Grange can and does urge the construction and ownership of the Nicaragua Canal by the United States Government; but it has been silent on the larger question of "imperialism," not because the question is not of supreme importance to the members of the Order, but because the question became a subject of party controversy. This neutral policy as to party questions imposes certain limitations on the influence of the organization; but experience has demonstrated that this, more than any other thing, is responsible for the fact that the Grange still lives and thrives.

The other misconception lies in the sentence quoted from Prof. Johnston, that the Grange has for its object "co-operation among farmers in

purchasing and in other business interests"; the implication being that business was the chief function. It is generally admitted that in the early days thousands joined the Order "for what there was in it"; believing that the organization furnished a means for abolishing the middle-men, and putting ready money into the pockets of the farmers. When these sordid souls were disillusioned, their enthusiasm went down to the zero of activity. They misunderstood, or interpreted too radically, a well-defined, conservative, legitimate purpose of the Grange to coöperate on business lines. The Order did believe that farmers could do without the surplus of middle-men; it did purpose to aid the farmer financially, though this purpose was not its main function. In the earlier period Grange stores were organized. A few of these are in successful operation to-day, but the policy as a whole has been abandoned.

Another plan, discussed over twenty-five years ago, has during the past decade come to assume practical importance as a method of co-operation on business lines. The plan, in brief, is that the various State Granges contract with manufacturing and jobbing houses to furnish members of the Order with goods at practically wholesale rates. Goods are ordered by the Subordinate Granges, under seal of the Order; are purchased on a cash basis; and are shipped to the purchasing agent of the Grange, and by him distributed to the individual buyers. Such materials as binder twine, salt, harness, Paris green, all kinds of farm implements, vehicles, sewing machines, and fruit trees are purchased advantageously. In many cases members save enough to pay all their expenses for maintaining the Grange. Even staple groceries, etc., are sometimes bought in this way. There is no capital invested; there are no debts imposed upon himself by the purchaser; and there has not been extreme difficulty in securing favorable contracts. The plan seems destined to continued enlargement and usefulness as a legitimate phase of business coöperation.

In several States the organization successfully conducts mutual fire-insurance companies; active membership in the Grange being an essential requisite for membership in the insurance company. Wherever these companies have become well established, it is asserted that they maintain a lower rate of assessment than even the popular "farmers' mutuals." It is said that "forty-one of the one hundred and twelve mutual fire-insurance companies in New York are under Grange auspices, and carry policies amounting to \$100,000,000, at an annual cost of about \$1.09 per \$1,000." Single companies claim even better results. This insurance not only pays individuals, but it attracts and holds

members. In New Hampshire a successful Grange life-insurance company exists.

In coöperative selling, the Order has so far accomplished very little, except locally and among individuals or Granges. There is a supreme difficulty in the way of successful transfers among Patrons themselves, as members desiring to buy wish the very lowest prices; those desiring to sell, the very highest prices. Arbitration under such circumstances is not easy. The fundamental obstacle to members selling together on the general market is that, in most cases, all members do not have the same things to sell. A coöperative creamery, for instance, is organized on the basis of a *product* — butter; the Grange is organized on the basis of *manhood* — and each man may have his crop or stock specialty. This difficulty, though grave, is not, perhaps, insuperable, and will tend to disappear as membership enlarges. But it is only fair to state that, so far, the Grange has not been able to devise any successful plan for coöperative selling, applicable on a large scale.

There are two or three features that deserve further mention. One is the position of the family in the Grange. It is stated that the Grange was the first secret organization to place woman on a plane of perfect equality with man. In every association each female member has a vote. Woman has four special offices assigned to her sex, and is eligible to any office in the gift of the Order. The majority of Subordinate Lecturers are women; many Subordinate and even Pomona Masters are women; Michigan's State Lecturer is a woman who is revolutionizing the educational work of the Order in that State; while Minnesota has a competent and earnest woman as State Master. Every delegate to every State Grange is a dual delegate — man and wife. The State Master and his wife are delegates to the National Grange. Women serve on all committees in these gatherings, and a woman's voice is frequently heard in debates. And not only the wife, but, as previously stated, the children above fourteen years of age may attain full membership. A large proportion of every healthy Grange consists of young people, who have their share in the active work. Thus it will be seen that the Order conserves the family life. It is doubtful if any other social institution in rural communities, not excepting the church, so completely interests the entire family.

The organization is also a conservator of morals. While sectarian discussions are as foreign to its purposes as is partisan politics, and while it does not even pretend to take the place of the church, it is built on a truly religious foundation. Its ritual is permeated, in word and in sen-

timent, by the religious spirit. Every meeting opens and closes with prayer. Moral character is constantly eulogized and glorified in Grange esoteric literature. The membership comes almost exclusively from that large class of farmers who are moral, high-minded, God-fearing men and women.

The Grange has been opposed, both by farmers and by others, because secrecy is not a desirable attribute; but the experience of nearly thirty years and the uniform testimony of all leaders in the work declare that this was a wise provision. No influential member has, so far as it is known, proposed that the Order should be dismantled of its secret features. The ritualistic work is not burdensome. Occasionally the processes of initiation may take time that ought to be allotted to educational work; but, if the initiation is properly conducted, it has of itself a high educational value.

The financial status of the Grange itself is worth noting. The fees for joining are merely nominal, while the dues are only ten cents a month per member. These fees and dues support the Subordinate Granges, the State Grange, and the National Grange. There are no high-salaried officials in the Order, and few salaried positions of any kind. The National Grange to-day has over \$50,000 in its treasury, and several State Granges have substantial reserves. This policy is pursued, not for the love of hoarding, but because it is believed that it tends to the permanency and solidarity of the Order.

It is sincerely to be hoped that this sketch will have convinced every reader who is interested in the prosperity of our rural classes that the Grange is a live institution; that it has within itself the capacity for satisfying a great need in rural society; and that it is destined to growth and larger and more permanent usefulness. In conclusion, may it not be allowable to sum up the chief reasons for the hope of progress just expressed? The Grange is based on correct principles: organization, coöperation, education. It is neither a political party nor a business agency. It is progressively conservative—or conservatively progressive. It is neither ultra-radical nor forever in the rut. Its chief work is on cultural lines. It includes the entire family. It is now growing, and there is every reason for thinking that this growth is of a permanent character.

The Grange is ambitious to take its place beside the school and the church, as one of a trinity of forces that shall mould the life of the farmer on the broadest possible basis—material, intellectual, social, and ethical. Is there any good reason why this ambition is not worthy, or why its goal should not be won?

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD.

THE SEARCH AFTER NOVELTY IN LITERATURE.

"**THERE** is nothing new under the sun," say the sages of all nations; and, in general, they are right. Historians make this clear to us every day. I do not mean merely recorders of political history; I use the word history in its broadest sense, to include the history of science as well as of art, that of literature as well as of social institutions. Historic researches in all branches of knowledge are conducted to-day at fever heat, and this may, perhaps, be accounted for by the fact that we feel ourselves so lacking in original ideas that we must live on those of the past.

At all events, the historians are counted among the great men of to-day; and they are just as proud of finding a predecessor to a modern theory or invention, as are those inventors and scholars who believe that their inventions or theories are original. Darwin does no more than repeat the thought of the old Greek philosopher Heraclitus. The utilitarian philosophy of Bentham and Mill and of their contemporary disciples established principles which had been already affirmed by the Greek Sophists of the second generation, among them Hippias of Keos. Comte's and Littré's scientific method of positivism has had its representatives since the very origin of thought. Lombroso's physiognomical studies have been preceded by similar ones made by Lavater, Gambattista della Porta, and even Pythagoras.

In our days, science as a whole, taking for its basis the idea that matter and force are identical, after having gone astray for a while in crude materialism, simply comes back to the conception held by the great erudites and mystics of most remote antiquity, from Rama and Krishna to the priests of Isis, Orpheus, and down to Plato. The strange resemblances between the precepts of our most modern hygienists and the laws written for the people of Israel by Moses have been minutely dwelt upon. Professors of ecclesiastical history write most interesting essays bearing such significant titles as "Reformers Before the Time of the Reformation."

And the historians are perfectly right. All these ideas and thoughts existed long before our century. The circumstances under which they are now promulgated may differ; we probably know a few more facts

which serve to illustrate them in a new way; perhaps we use different expressions in presenting them; but all these are exterior elements only, which come and go in their turn. In the nineteenth century we have put to practical use several of these ideas, such as action at a distance by electricity in the form of the telegraph, telephone, etc.; but the ideas themselves are not new, any more than the idea of flying will be new when the machine enabling man to soar into the upper air shall have been invented. Mr. Stockton's novel, "Negative Gravity," is a proof of this, and so are other stories in which the date of this invention is anticipated.

If we now consider literature more particularly — and literature is nothing more than philosophy put within reach of everybody — we shall there find the same phenomenon. It is dwelt upon with a sort of passion by the historians — who here assume the name of "critics," perhaps with the object of making the public believe that the meting out of justice in this department is a special office. At all events, they cannot be accused of lack of zeal in proving that every thing new is interwoven with what is old, no matter what the true value of such efforts may be.

Not a day goes by without bringing us one or more volumes destined to deprive some author of the honor of being original in his writings, and transferring that honor upon some forgotten precursor. Here it is Rousseau, to whom the idea of the "Contrat Social" is not credited, the credit being given to La Boétie; there it is Bunyan, who is supposed to have found in France a whole literature treating of pilgrimages, of which he made use in his famous book; then it is Molière's turn, who is to be accused of taking without any hesitation what he could get from Cyrano de Bergerac, from Plautus, and from ever so many others, thus getting his best and most inspired scenes. A short time ago M. Brunetière proved that the great thoughts which have endeared to us the names of Pascal and Bossuet are originally found in Ronsard. More recently still we had to listen to the somewhat startling news that Poe's "Raven" had been written for the first time about twenty centuries ago, by the Chinese poet Kia Yi.

Similar researches, with similar results, might be made in connection with contemporary literature. Let us closely examine some of the most sensational theories which have sprung up within the last few decades. All of them have been advanced more than once in the course of bygone centuries; and it may be safely said that those which above all others bear the stamp of novelty, in the eyes of the majority of the people, are the most ancient of all. Look at the famous *Uebermensch* of Nietzsche,

an idea which has been pronounced to be most frightfully audacious, and which means, as we know, that a few select members of the human race have the right to place themselves above all the rest, to reign supreme, to subject every thing to their pleasure, to crush, without pity, without feeling, the bulk of slave-like humanity ; that the world has been created for these select beings ; and that the crowd has been created to serve them. It is the philosophy of life which governed barbarous antiquity ; it is the principle which sanctioned the deeds of the great Oriental despots — those who subjugated entire nations in order to make them execute, under the government of the whip, such works as would render their reign illustrious ; the principle of the Cæsars of Rome ; of the lords of the Middle Ages ; of the great Occidental sovereigns, such as Louis XIV ; in short, the principle which brought about the French Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century, and which is perpetuated in our day, thanks to the potentates of wealth.

It is true that Nietzsche's *Uebermensch* would never make use of his power in procuring such wholly material pleasures as did the ancient monarchs or as do many modern possessors of great wealth. That would be a profoundly erroneous conception of the idea which the German philosopher had in mind. What is here under discussion is simply the power ; and in order to develop even the superior side of the human being, the principle of social inequality must be put to practical use. Nietzsche was not the first to offer to the world this conception in the form of a philosophical theory. His most illustrious predecessor was the great Aristotle himself. And in France, M. Oudinot has just tried to prove that Carlyle also was a predecessor of Nietzsche.

Ruskin was another of those who gave a new impetus to thought. But it is not possible to find among his revolutionary ideas a single one which had not been offered to humanity before. His fundamental argument — return to Nature herself — was advanced with at least as much fervor and vigor by Rousseau ; and the latter offered it in a much broader form than did the former. Ruskin saw only that art was to be reformed ; and art was, therefore, with him the central point of action. Rousseau saw that life itself had to be reformed ; and only through such reform did he propose to reach society, education, the state, art. In other words, Rousseau first wanted to see life reformed and then art, while Ruskin wanted to reform life through a reformation in art, which, it seems to me, looks like turning things round, like standing the pyramid on its apex. His strong words in favor of manual and mechanical arts most vividly call to mind how these same arts had been in favor with

the French Encyclopedists in the eighteenth century, notably with Diderot and D'Alembert, who in their turn had received inspiration from Francis Bacon. Roger Bacon held the same views, and so did Albertus Magnus, in the Middle Ages. And if we go back to antiquity we find many wise men speaking in favor of manual arts. Is it necessary to recall that St. Paul was a tent-maker? Finally, most of Ruskin's schemes for reorganizing human society may be found in the Utopias dreamed about for centuries, among them in Plato's Republic, which remains the finest example of this kind of literature.

Nor is anarchical literature, of which the most distinguished representative is M. Elisée Reclus, and which is so full of generous and high ideals, by any means novel in its fundamental thoughts. The Abbey of Thélème, sketched by Rabelais in the sixteenth century, is nothing less than a picture of an ideal state of society where anarchism reigns; where law is no longer necessary, the good will of everybody being sufficient to insure order; and where the motto of the good Jean des Entommeureurs, "Do whatever you wish," might be applicable. And anarchical communism has not only been proposed, but it was carried out, in part, by the Essenes, in the time of Christ, and by several mystic sects during the Middle Ages.

From all that has been said, it would seem that there is no novelty in literature. Man constantly turns about in a circle of ideas, stopping at one, and then again at another. But the further we advance, the less we must expect to find any novelty in theories. Even if we cannot trace the existence of some of them in the past, by means of written documents, there are still ten thousand chances to one that they were expressed in documents that have been lost or that have not yet been found, or orally, as in the case, for example, of the mysteries of antiquity in all countries.

On the other hand, some actual facts seem to speak against this point of view. We constantly hear of "original authors." Their works are devoured as if they were new Gospels, and they are discussed as if the ideas expressed therein had never been held by others. I have just given a few names of such contemporary writers, to which I might add many more.

But this is only an apparent contradiction. We must distinguish between novelty in the absolute sense of the word and in its relative sense. If the former does not exist, there is no reason why the latter should not. If a person has never heard of a certain idea, this idea, when presented to him, will be new to him, even if it has been expressed somewhere else, again and again. Moreover, an individual, as well as

humanity as a whole, may greet as novel an idea possessed at some past time, but which has disappeared from the memory.

All this is very simple. And so it is easy to understand that we do not need absolute novelty in order to produce the particular effect with which we are concerned in literature. It is sufficient if there is an appearance of novelty to the eyes of the literary public. Nietzsche, in treating of his *Uebermensch*, seemed to offer something quite new, since he addressed an audience with whom ideas of social equality reigned supreme; Ruskin apparently offered some novelty — when, as a matter of fact, he demanded, in so many words, a return to old ideas — because his hearers were a class of people holding that progress could be attained only through the mechanical and electrical industries; Reclus and the anarchists could claim originality for their idea of liberation from every form of government, merely because they preached at a time of absolute political corruption and vile bureaucracy.

We find these phenomena not only in the domain of intelligence, but in other channels: in that of fashion, for example. We discard a small hat for a large one; a high heel has to make way for a low one; a wide sleeve is abandoned for a tight-fitting one; a low collar gives way to one reaching up to the ears. And whatever appears new for the moment seems most attractive. In the same way, we change our ideas, giving up one to accept another, and still another. We return to the first after we have completely forgotten it, and find it attractive because its beauty is again fresh to us. Thus, the success of a thought in literature does not primarily depend upon its intrinsic value, but upon the moment in which it is presented. Of course, I do not forget for a moment the part which the form must play in literature. A writer must know how to write. This is in a sense the very first condition of success. But so far as the present discussion is concerned this phase of the question must be left entirely aside, although novelty has been sought sometimes by way of a revolution in style.

What I have just described is a law of contrast; but one must be careful not to mistake it for a law of action and reaction. Action and reaction can only take place in the same line of thought. For example, there is action and reaction in theism and atheism, in the principle of social equality and inequality. But literature is not bound to follow any single line of thought. It treats of all of them, in their turn, and there is no possibility of establishing a law which would justify the line it follows. Perhaps it might be said that it is governed by the work done by scientists and philosophers, that when some important discovery has been

made, literature takes hold and makes use of it. But that is only putting off the answer to the question, for there is no law which governs the regular return of discoveries in any line whatever; and again it is necessary that the discovery should be one that adapts itself to use in literature.

If an attempt were made to explain the various tendencies met with in literature, the explanation would probably be found in the special taste of each author; and I think it would be difficult to find a law governing even that. The ultimate end is this, that the literary public becomes an ethnologist with Loti, a psychologist with Bourget, a hypnotist with Du Maurier, a moralist with Tolstoy, a theologian with Mrs. Humphry Ward, a socialist with Sudermann.

The law of contrast seems, in reality, a small matter; and yet we shall see that it settles many a question in philosophy as well as in literature, which, without that law, would be difficult to answer. Let me point out a few instances.

Only a very superficial reader can overlook the fact that the ideas which are most readily accepted by the public in a new book are often very simple, merely the expression of the most ordinary common sense. Of course, there is the beauty and the force of language; but the idea itself, the nucleus, is so simple, so astonishingly *naïf* even, that, on thinking it over, it is hard to realize that a man of talent should be willing to devote so much labor in order to say something so self-evident, and that the readers should become enthusiastic over such elementary truths.

Let us take, for example, "Die Ehre," by Sudermann. Few works have excited such keen emotion in Europe. And what is the idea that the famous author offers us? That honor cannot be bought with money; that a poor man has his honor to lose as well as a rich man; that honor is no more an attribute of money than is intelligence. Is this not extremely simple, extremely *naïf*? It is a truth admitted by every person of sound judgment. But the circles in which Sudermann proclaimed this truth were so used to holding the opposite view, and literature had adapted itself so well to this view, that what was simply natural and self-evident became novel. In America, where the idea of inequality in this particular sense does not exist, Sudermann's drama did not meet with success. What is true of Sudermann in Germany is equally true of Dumas the younger in France. His "paradoxes" are nothing but utterances of the most simple common sense. They are truths good to be served to all who have not been saturated with contrary ideas.

Except on the theory of a craving after contrast as a stimulant to rouse interest, it would be difficult to account for the taste which the

literary public of to-day, used to refinement and elegance, shows for popular literature, which is often crude and coarse, rendered in a heavy, discordant dialect, and handled with primitive simplicity. But it is this very contrast which gives us pleasure. And the æsthetic enjoyment which a man of culture derives from such works is much greater than that which the simple-minded reader, for whom they were originally written, gets out of them. In Germany, Fritz Reutter seems to become more popular each year. In general, a book containing a goodly portion of dialect and slang has a great deal in its favor. We have but to think of the songs of the famous Aristide Bruand, in Paris, or of the "Songs of the Ghetto," by Morris Rosenfeld, written in the language of the laborers of the sweat-shops of New York, where the author worked. It is the same disregard of literary pretensions and modern researches which attracts hundreds of thousands to the Passion Play of Oberammergau, and which insures the success of the present actors of Schliersee. Within the last few years, literary epicureans have frequented the Théâtre du Peuple, founded by Maurice Pottecher, in Bussang, France. Perhaps, too, the Swiss National Theatre, which has been called into life within the last ten years, under the name of "Festspiele," owes a part of its success to the same cause.

Another phenomenon frequently met with is that, during an epoch rather barren of ideas, such as ours is, we eventually — and courageously — go *back* a few centuries in order to get *new* impressions. We become enamored of an author or an artist to whom some critic calls our attention. There have been several striking examples of this within the last few years. Ten years ago, in Germany, we found the book "Rembrandt als Erzieher," which, for the time being, was very famous. In Italy, scarcely more than two years ago — at the end of the nineteenth century — D'Annunzio suggested Sophocles and the Greek stage as scenic models. At present, M. Brunetière proposes to France a man whose ideas are two hundred years old. Is it necessary to recall here the name of Omar Khayyám?

In my opinion, we can most rationally explain the pronounced tendency in the literature of our time in this way, namely, that after having for twenty years discussed, argued, attacked, and defended some theories, the need is felt of going to the other extreme, of giving up for a time what is called argumentative literature. It seems that the cry of the reading public is: Give us books which prove nothing, which do not tire our overtaxed brains. I do not think that there is need of going any further in order to explain what has been so often touched upon in the

magazines of late, namely, the cordial welcome with which historical novels have been greeted in recent years. And the almost unheard-of success of "Cyrano de Bergerac," by Rostand, cannot be accounted for simply by the talent of the author, who, after all, is only a very witty man. Moreover, the public does not regard with displeasure books that sneer at science and reason, with which we have been satisfied for so long a time. Balfour's "Foundation of Belief," which appeared a few years ago, and which was received with clamorous applause, is a good example of this. People were tired of the arguments of reason, and saw with pleasure the attack made upon it and the ridicule it received at the hands of the author.

It will be seen that this law, although at first appearing very simple, is not without its value, in that it offers at least some tangible explanation of phenomena otherwise unexplained. It might be said that this search after novelty in literature, in preference to what is excellent, perhaps, but old, is due to the fact that we are not satisfied with the present conditions of life, that we look to literature in order to find something better. This may be one reason, but I do not think it is the chief one. Those desiring excellence may find any number of books to their liking. The practical influence of an idea treated in a literary work must be looked upon as a derived effect only, independent of the reader's will. The chief purpose in perusing a literary work seems to be the hope of finding in it some food for intellectual excitement. Tolstoy is widely read and enjoyed; yet very few would think of putting his ideas into practical use. The pleasure consists in finding that one is thinking his thoughts with him.

Again, the mind requires exercise as well as the body; and when it has assimilated one idea it must take up another. That is why an author who leaves the beaten tracks has a better chance of gaining a hearing. The public sides with the heretic and not with the orthodox, at least in literature. It can be readily seen that this longing for something new on the part of the public is a wholly normal condition — a phenomenon founded upon a psychological truth. If the reader were not interested in what is new, it would be a proof that the fire of his intelligence had gone out.

At the same time, of course, the authors are justified in their desire to be original; and instead of reproaching them for this desire, as is so often done, they should be encouraged. They may not make a happy choice in the road they select, but they are right in choosing one of their own. It goes without saying that there is bad novelty and good novelty.

But is it wise to deprive ourselves of the latter under pretence of escaping from the former, and denounce the search after originality "as the worst disease of our time," as does M. de la Sizeranne ("Revue des Deux Mondes," June 1, 1900)? There is the fear of leading the taste of the public astray; but how can it ever acquire taste if it is never put to the test, or if it never sees anything but the beautiful? Having lived in the century which gave us a Hegel, ought we to be ignorant of the fact that the beautiful exists only because the ugly exists, that there is good only because there is bad, that there is the grand only because there is pettiness? But to return to the authors: should they be denied a trial at being original for the reason that they may not succeed at once, perhaps not at all? Do we learn gymnastics by means of tying our hands and feet? One must be paradoxical in order to merit the attention of the literary public — paradoxical, at least, in the relative sense of the word, if not in the absolute.

A literary school is practically dead the very moment it is recognized by the public as a school; for its fundamental principles have become familiar; judgment has been pronounced upon them; it has given every thing of value that it had in its power to give; and subsequent works are only repetitions of what is already known. An author should carefully avoid the mistake of walking in the footsteps of some successful writer of the day; for by so doing he will almost be sure to fail. There have been numerous imitations of "Rembrandt als Erzieher," but all such productions have fallen flat; and among the vast number of those who have cultivated Ibsenism, there is not one who can truthfully say of himself that he has attracted the attention of a serious critic. Great names which have found a place by the side of Zola (Guy de Maupassant, Huysmans) have become great because the authors themselves have had some originality to show; entertaining but very distant relations with their so-called master.

The books of such a writer as Tolstoy are read, after a few years have gone by, from habit rather than because they interest the public. The number of his readers may even increase with each new work that he publishes; but these readers are only such as constitute the ordinary element of the public, following a fashion that has already gone by, while the cultured class of readers has long ago interested itself in something else. Some authors know this very well; and when they have exhausted an idea they try to keep the attention fixed upon themselves by working some other vein. But they are not always successful in adopting this plan, since people are not fond of accepting any other label than the one

they are used to see in connection with a name. Zola, for example, proceeded from naturalism to idealism in "Le Rêve"; and later on, having made the round of naturalism, he took up socialism in "Lourdes," "Rome," and "Paris."

Let us now apply the foregoing remarks to recent literature. The perfectly simple and rational explanation we arrive at concerning its somewhat puzzling productions is the best proof of the truth of what I have said. Never before has the fever of novelty been so pronounced as it is now. Indeed, it may well be asserted that this is the most salient feature of contemporary literature. It seems that there is no eccentricity which recent authors decline to satisfy. Some have taken this as an argument to the effect that the chase after novelty is in itself a novelty. I do not think that is so. Man's nature has not changed; and all who have been able to devote themselves to things of the mind have always been what they now are. The condition of novelty was complied with in the past as it is in the present.

But the circumstances under which the authors write to-day are very different from what they once were. The knowledge that the reading public acquires is much greater than it formerly was. The women of the middle classes of to-day know more than was known to the grand ladies of the eighteenth century, whose celebrated *salons* had such a profound influence upon the ideas and events of the civilized world. Also the means of making knowledge known are far greater than in the past—not only through books, but through magazines and newspapers. Consequently, even though the actual knowledge possessed by the masses may not have become deeper, it is yet considerable enough for them to decline to accept something appearing novel, but which is not so, as willingly as they did formerly, when their only intellectual nourishment consisted of the events of every-day life and the catechism.

Finally, there is science in general, the science of professional scholars, which has become greatly enriched by the researches made within the last decades. The professional men constantly publish the results of their investigations. Their avidity in making inquiries concerning the origin of ideas expressed by modern authors has already been mentioned. And, besides, they are continually narrowing the field of action to the newcomer through the old books they are editing, thus placing before the reader the celebrated men of past centuries. Thus, day by day the task of laying hands on some idea that does not seem trite to the reader becomes harder.

Under these circumstances, what could be done by our poets and prose

writers? They were obliged to develop other ideas than those which naturally interest every human being, which obtrude upon every thinker, and which had already been treated over and over again by well-known authors. Next, they had to treat their subjects in a way to make them appear more striking and important than they actually were, *i.e.*, in an extraordinary, abnormal fashion. Eccentricity in all respects became their watchword. Not that they chose it: they were forced to accept it if they wished to write any thing that might be considered worthy of attracting the attention of a surfeited public.

Take, for example, the Symbolists, in France, who have been so frequently an object of mockery, even to the most serious people. Among them we may find some clowns, perhaps; but a great many of them are serious and sincere, even when their zeal leads them on to the ridiculous. Their great mistake, after all, is that having fully realized the circumstances which they have had to face, they have acted accordingly. They have clutched the last straw that was left to them by a century which seems to have seen every thing and known every thing; and their principle, in a few words, is about this: "Until now we have walked on our feet; let us then try to walk on our heads." (Huysmans has boldly entitled one of his most suggestive works "*À Rebours*" (*Upside Down*).) "Until now things have been done in one way; let us try the opposite way. Let us do the contrary of every thing that constitutes the basis of life's work; for this, at all events, will not be commonplace — we shall certainly find new emotions, new pleasures, new art. Until now we have prayed because we have been pious, because we have believed in God; let us then go to church not because we have religious faith, but in order to gain for ourselves an artificial excitement of our religious nature. On the whole, let us look for every thing that is artificial, abnormal, and morbid, and proclaim it; and let us submit the results to our readers."

Max Nordau made a reputation for himself by treating these authors as degenerates, and by giving a pathological reason for every thing that is out of the common in their works. I do not wish to deny the existence of a pathological element in many a modern literary and artistic production. I even positively believe that there is such. But this pathological element accounts for exceptional cases only; it is not the rule. The mere fact that Nordau puts all these authors in the same class, from the Preraphaelites down to Nietzsche and the Symbolists, makes us feel suspicious. It involuntarily reminds one of the sally of Montesquieu: "Of course . . . they lock up a few fools in a house, in order to convince the world that those who are outside are not crazy."

I may say, then, that the explanation here offered is more satisfactory. With it there is no need to have recourse to such extraordinary arguments; nor is it necessary to declare that any artist who does not adhere exclusively to the commonplace is ready for an asylum. Why these authors, in spite of the logical basis of their method, have succeeded only partially is easily explained by the unfavorable conditions under which they have been working. There may be other explanations also, but it lies beyond the scope of this paper to discuss them. Nor is it the province of this article to consider whether it is not possible to imagine a literature of to-morrow which would avoid the defects of that of to-day, and yet command attention by reason of novelty.

ALBERT SCHINZ.

WRITERS IN THE APRIL FORUM.

MR. O. P. AUSTIN, a native of Illinois, enlisted at the age of seventeen in the Union army, toward the close of the Civil War. Since reaching manhood has been a newspaper writer, reporter, and editor. Became a resident of Washington in 1881, and in 1898 was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Statistics. Mr. Austin is the author of a number of semi-statistical publications—"Uncle Sam's Secrets," "Uncle Sam's Soldiers," etc.—intended for the instruction of youth, and now used for that purpose in public schools of leading cities.

MR. JOSIAH WILLIAM BAILEY was born in Warrenton, North Carolina, in 1873. In 1893 received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Wake Forest College, in that State. Immediately thereafter became connected with the "Biblical Recorder," one of the oldest religious weeklies in the South, being the organ of the North Carolina Baptists, the most numerous religious body in the State; and in 1895 became editor of that paper, which position he now holds. Mr. Bailey gives especial attention to the cause of universal education in North Carolina, and has engaged not only in the task of readjusting the suffrage, but also in that of obtaining the promises of fuller liberty and better feeling on the part of the advocates of the disfranchisement of the negroes.

MR. KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD was born in Michigan, in 1868. Was educated in the public schools of Lapeer and Port Huron, and at the Michigan Agricultural College, graduating from the latter institution in 1891. The following year became editor of the "Grange Visitor," a paper published by the State Grange, which paper was four years later merged into the "Michigan Farmer." Now has charge of the Grange department of the latter paper. In 1895 was chosen State Superintendent of Farmers' Institutes, with headquarters at the Agricultural College, and held this position for four years, organizing, under the State law, an annual farmers' institute in every agricultural county in the State. Mr. Butterfield is at present pursuing graduate studies at the University of Michigan, with special reference to the relation of economics and sociology to the rural problem. Has occasionally contributed articles to magazines.

MR. ALEXANDER HUME FORD was graduated from the engineering department of Porter Academy, Charleston, South Carolina, in 1885. Spent two years in newspaper work, and then five years in the employ of the officials constructing the Georgia Central and the Richmond and West Point Railways. Returning to journalism, he was connected with the leading newspapers and magazines of New York and Chicago. In 1899 visited Siberia and Manchuria with the Russo-American engineers, who have supplied the Chinese Eastern Railway with materials of construction. Owing to the semi-official connection of the party with the Manchurian Railway, opportunities for gathering information were freely accorded by the Russian engineers and officials. Mr. Ford has just returned from a visit to the Continent, where he was offered every facility for obtaining information as to engineering work in European Russia. For the past two years, has studied in person the waterway systems of parts of Europe and Asia, and expects to visit those of the other continents in time.

REV. EDWARD EVERETT HALE was born April 8, 1822; is a Unitarian minister in Boston, Massachusetts, where he has lived since 1856. His father was Nathan Hale, for half a century prominent as editor of the Boston "Daily Advertiser," and a leader in the internal improvement of the country by railroads, from 1826 until the

time of his death. Nathan Hale was the first president of the Boston and Albany Railroad, and chairman of the committee for introducing water into Boston. Mr. E. E. Hale graduated at Harvard College in 1839, and was ordained as a minister at Worcester in 1846. His first work in national affairs was his share, as a director of the Emigrant Aid Company, in the settlement of Kansas. In the war was closely connected with the Sanitary Commission. As a writer for "The Atlantic Monthly," his articles were written with national and patriotic purposes. "The Man Without a Country," printed in 1863, gained wide circulation. Has edited "The Christian Examiner," "Old and New," and "Lend a Hand." Among his best-known works are "Two Times One" and "In His Name." Has earnestly advocated a "High Court of Nations," such as is now established and described in his present article.

HON. WILLIAM C. MAINS was born in New York State in 1871. Graduated from New York University in 1892, and later studied as a graduate student in the same institution and abroad (Halle and Berlin). Has held the chair of History and Economics in the University of Denver, and in Ursinus College, Pennsylvania. In 1897 he abandoned the academic life and entered upon the practice of the law. Has taken an interest in the theory and practice of politics, and, as a Republican, represents the first assembly district of Westchester, in the New York State Legislature.

MR. EDWARD S. MEADE, born in 1874, was graduated from De Pauw University in 1896. Fellow in Political Economy, Universities of Chicago and Pennsylvania, 1896-1900. Ph.D. in economics, University of Pennsylvania, 1899. Was appointed instructor in Commerce and Industry in the Wharton School of Finance and Economy of the University of Pennsylvania, 1900. Has published various articles in economic journals.

EX-SENATOR W. A. PEFFER, born in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania, in 1831, attended public school in the winter months, and at fifteen began teaching in winter, working on the farm during the summer. Served three years as private and lieutenant with the 83d Regiment of Illinois Volunteers in the War of the Rebellion. Established two newspapers in Southern Kansas—one in 1870, the other five years later. Served as a member of the Kansas State Senate, 1875-76. Was editor of the "Kansas Farmer" in 1881. Became prominently identified with agricultural interests, and was conspicuous in the farmers' movement in 1889-90. His pamphlet, "The Way Out," appeared in 1890. Was elected to the United States Senate in 1891, and served one full term. Is now engaged in literary work.

MR. ALBERT SCHINZ was born in the French part of Switzerland about thirty years ago. Attended school in Neuchâtel, and later the University of that city, from which he was graduated in 1888. Then went to Berlin and Tübingen, where he devoted his time especially to philosophy and literature. In 1894 received degree of Ph.D. at Tübingen. Afterward studied at Paris. In 1897 came to America, and is now teacher of French literature at Bryn Mawr College. Mr. Schinz has been a frequent contributor to European magazines.

MR. ALDACE F. WALKER, a native of Vermont, was graduated from Middlebury College; served three years in a Vermont regiment; studied law at Columbia College Law School; practised his profession for six years in New York City, and for fifteen years at Rutland, Vermont. Was Interstate Commerce Commissioner for two years, from April, 1887, and chairman of various railway associations in Chicago until 1894. Was appointed a receiver of the Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fé Railroad and its allied lines; and since January 1, 1896, has been Chairman of the Board of Directors of the reorganized Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fé Railway Co., in charge of the New York office.

MR. HENRY REMSEN WHITEHOUSE was born in Brooklyn, New York, in 1857, and was educated in Germany, Switzerland, and England. Afterward studied at the Paris Beaux-Arts, under Gérôme. Was sent by President Arthur as Consul-General and Secretary of Legation to Guatemala; then by President Cleveland to Mexico, and by President Harrison to Rome, as Secretary of Legation. Also served at Copenhagen and Madrid. Is the author of "Sacrifice of a Throne," and "Collapse of the Kingdom of Naples," and is now engaged upon a third book on Italian history.

THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXI, NO. 3.

MAY, 1901.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

**COPYRIGHT, 1900.
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.**

**PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
32-34 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK**

The Forum

MAY, 1901.

AGUINALDO'S CAPTURE AND THE PHILIPPINE COM-MISSION.

IN the short lives of some things, last month must be reckoned as antiquity. And thus, at the beginning of May the most vulgar terms of abuse as well as the most extravagant terms of praise which, at the end of March and the beginning of April, were commonly applied to Gen. Funston's exploit may seem to belong to a rather remote past. I should like to be able to say that such extravagances will be forgotten altogether; but the historic interest of the event itself will certainly preserve its attendant circumstances. Future generations will surely know that in the hot discussion which arose on receipt of the news in this country, such epithets as "spy," "sneak," "disgrace to the United States," and "forger" were answered by unqualified endorsements, and the assertion that this enterprise "was distinctively American, and worthy of the *best traditions* of our army."

These undeserving things, then — the dead forms of intemperate censure and of intemperate praise — I suppose must always be remembered; but my sole purpose in referring to them at present is to show how far away from the main issue we strayed, blinded and misguided by the passion of the moment or by partisanship. For, while the discussion was virtually confined to the question whether Gen. Funston's course had been admirable or the contrary, a fact of very high importance was ignored. Indeed, it was by implication denied, and hitherto the denial has been allowed to pass unchallenged. It was either taken for granted that this successful stroke in eastern Luzon was an outcome of the un-

aided work of the army, or that disputable claim was advanced positively, in so many words. For example, the leading editorial in "The Army and Navy Journal" of March 30th contained the following passage, which is extraordinary enough in one sense, and yet can be cited as a representative statement:

"If Congress in the session of 1899-1900 had taken the advice of 'The Army and Navy Journal' and had done then what it did last winter, the same speedy end of Aguinaldo's pretensions would doubtless have come that has followed so quickly the passage of the Army bill. When this bill became a law at the request of officers doing duty in the Philippines a synopsis of it was cabled to Manila by the editor, and the officers and men of our army, as well as the intelligent natives, knew in a few days that the dilly-dallying military methods of the United States had given place to a policy in which there would be no turning back. No clearer, more decisive vindication of the judgment of those who have been called 'imperialists,' because they saw and were not afraid to speak of the army's needs, could be desired than this triumph of the new army. . . . Again is our oft-stated proposition that a large army is a powerful agency for peace proved true by the hard logic of facts. Those humanitarians and philosophers that will unctuously profess to find special pleasure in the prospect of early peace in the Philippines will now see that they have to thank not the professional peace-lovers, but the hard-headed wearers of uniforms who knew they could end their task if they had the means."

One of the men who began early in 1899, whenever he had opportunity, to "speak [or write] of the army's needs," and to urge the Administration to place an adequate force at Gen. Otis's disposal — though he is far from admitting that he has earned the name of "imperialist" by so doing — would now respectfully submit that the members of the Civil Commission, known as the Taft Commission, who are by profession judges or teachers, may properly be characterized as "professional peace-lovers"; and it is his aim, in the present article, to suggest that to precisely these civilians our thanks are due in large measure, with grateful recognition of their work as "a powerful agency for peace." Give due honor to our gallant army in this matter, but not "*All honor!*" as the cry has been; for it may become clear that the capture of the little president whom Americans have made famous, and similar events which appear to show that the Tagalog organization is going to pieces, cannot be placed to the sole credit of the "hard-headed wearers of uniforms."

Think how many problems of a similar nature the future may have in store for us as a nation. The conclusion that they either can be or should be disposed of by the military arm alone is not only contrary to the evidence, but is also likely to prove a most pernicious error, if the general public comes to accept it. Think, too, of the extraordinary obligation in this particular case. Our honor is to such an extent engaged for the correct understanding of such a matter involving the general

principle by which we should be guided in our dealings with Filipinos, that he who sins against wisdom here does indeed wrong his own soul.

The readers of THE FORUM may recall a rather vague, though decidedly alarming, rumor which was caught up by the daily papers in November of last year, to the effect that years of warfare would be required to subdue the Filipinos. This was shortly after the publication of Gen. MacArthur's report dated at Manila, October 1, 1900. They may also remember that, among the many sensational statements touching the fortunes of our troops in the Philippines, this disquieting rumor stood out with a peculiar distinction; being coupled, at least ostensibly, with an admission of the failure of the general plan of campaign instituted by Gen. Otis and greatly extended by Gen. MacArthur. That plan was to be abandoned, partially, the correspondents said, sounding a new note of discouragement. Their assertions, however, were contradicted so energetically at the time, on such excellent authority — which had excellent arrangements, too, for the circulation of its own rose-colored views, and a somewhat rough-and-ready method of suppressing the views not to be reconciled with its own — that, in fine, they failed to make a very deep impression on the mind of the public. The public practically declared, by its attitude of indifference, that it believed this to be a case of much smoke from a small fire.

Quite the opposite assumption would have come nearer the mark; or, in terms of the figure already employed, there was a big threatening fire with comparatively little smoke. The actual situation, undisclosed by the current accounts, probably became known outside official circles only to those who, with patience to investigate, had access also to private sources of information. It appears that there really was profound discouragement in certain quarters, though it was not equally shared by the American officers stationed in the various islands. No single individual, it is safe to say, can yet generalize the entire situation throughout the Philippine archipelago, so different were the conditions at different points; still we already know how the military problem was regarded by the most intelligent of our commanders in the Philippines before the Taft Commission got down to hard work. We know that such able men as the negotiator of the Sulu treaty saw no way out of the difficulties — short of ten years' fighting, with the forces on the ground, or five years, with an army one hundred thousand strong — until the civil commission both showed a way and took the lead in it.

This is very far from equivalent to an accusation that the army had failed. On the contrary, the army had added petty victory to petty

victory, making an almost unbroken series of successes, with barely a check now and again to relieve the monotony of foregone conclusions. It is, however, one way of saying that the army had done enough, or more than enough — more than the military arm should be called upon to perform in such situations. The time had come for the civil hand to grasp the nettle.

Now, if we take up Gen. MacArthur's report already referred to, which was prepared during this crisis, we shall see that even his more or less guarded and circumspect statements lead into a *cul-de-sac*.

He begins with the council of war held at Bayambang, about November 12, 1899, which was attended by Gen. Aguinaldo and many of the Filipino military leaders. A resolution was adopted, at that meeting, "to the effect that the insurgent forces were incapable of further resistance in the field, and as a consequence, it was decided to disband the army, the generals and men to return to their own provinces, with a view to organizing the people for general resistance by means of guerilla warfare." A little later he tells us that the Filipinos "seem to be actuated by the idea that, in all doubtful matters of politics or war, men are never nearer right than when going with their own kith and kin, regardless of the nature of the action or of its remote consequences." So, then, those not actually in the field were, by a blind, unreasoning instinct, impelled to aid the fighting men. And we read further:

"Most of the towns secretly organized complete insurgent municipal governments, to proceed simultaneously and in the same sphere as the American governments, and in many instances through the same personnel; that is to say, the *presidentes* and town officials acted openly in behalf of the Americans and secretly in behalf of the insurgents, . . . exacting and collecting contributions and supplies and recruiting men for the Filipino forces, and sending all obtainable military information to the Filipino leaders."

Invincible opposition, is it not? As for the cause of it, listen to this indefinite statement: "Nature, which is exuberant, balmy, and generous, has nourished into existence several millions of sensitive and credulous people, without allegiance to any existing institutions, but animated by certain inchoate ideas and aspirations, which by some unfortunate perversion of thought they conceive to be threatened by America." Note this utter failure to grasp the very distinct, clearly defined grievances that led to the popular uprising against the Spaniards, in which we interposed. Is not the military force which deals only with the evidences of discontent comparable to the physician who ignores morbid conditions and treats symptoms? Gen. MacArthur expresses the hope that the towns will gradually give up their devotion to the cause, and can suggest

no better course for himself and his perplexed officers and men than "maintaining the present status and waiting for the silent, but irresistible operation of time, which, reduced to a working formula, means amiability, patience, and — an adequate force." After reviewing all the conditions, he expresses the opinion that "at present and for many years to come the necessity of a large American military and naval force is too apparent to admit of discussion."

Does it not appear from all this that any one who looked to the army as the sole agency for the establishment of peace was fairly shut in to a prospect of the dreariest sort? Some of the commanding officers who had been in the habit of asking, when they met: "How long will it take us to put down the insurrection?" began to change the question, we are told, so that now it took the form: "Shall we *ever* be able to bring this thing to an end?"

Now let us turn to another powerful agency making for peace, not incidentally, but directly.

On the first of September, or a month prior to the date of Gen. MacArthur's report, the Taft Commission began its legislative and executive duties, under the instructions of the President. According to its own statement, at the outset "it adopted the policy of passing no laws, except in cases of emergency, without publishing them in the daily press after they had passed a second reading, and giving to the public an opportunity to come before the Commission and suggest objections or amendments to the bills." A difference in the manner, in the attitude, of this body, contrasting with the army's attitude, is perceived as soon as one takes up its accounts of plans and achievements. "We think that the holding of public sessions furnishes instructive lessons to the people, *as it certainly secures to the Commission a means of avoiding mistakes.*" Thus these professional peace-lovers refer to their friendly method of getting upon common ground with the natives. When they have prepared a tariff bill, as mentioned in their report of November 30th, modifying the Spanish tariff, and arranging the schedule so as to secure an adequate revenue with the least burden upon those least able to stand it, this measure "will not be adopted until all the interests in Manila and the island shall have had an opportunity to be heard on its various provisions."

Again, we find the Taft Commission attacking the all-important question of the Philippine friars; reasoning that "those who are charged with the duty of pacifying these islands may properly have the liveliest concern in a matter which, though on its surface only ecclesiastical, is, in the most important phase of it, political, and fraught with the most crit-

ical consequences to the peace and good order of the country in which it is their duty to set up civil government." They are but recognizing a sufficiently obvious fact when they say that "the burning political question, discussion of which strongly agitates the people of the Philippines, is whether the members of the four great orders of St. Dominic, St. Augustine, St. Francis, and the Recolletos shall return to the parishes from which they were driven by the revolution." Positive originality is shown, however, in the thoroughness of the investigation they conduct; and, finally, we have a clear-cut plan suggested, in view of the enmity which would be caused among the people against the American Government by the return of the friars:

"It would avoid some very troublesome agrarian disturbances between the friars and their quondam tenants, if the insular government could buy these large *haciendas* of the friars and sell them out in small holdings to the present tenants, who, forgiven for the rent due during the two years of war, would recognize the title of the Government without demur, and gladly accept an opportunity, by payment of the price in small instalments, to become absolute owners of that which they and their ancestors have so long cultivated. With the many other calls upon the insular treasury, a large financial operation like this could probably not be conducted to a successful issue without the aid of the United States Government, either by a direct loan or by a guarantee of bonds to be issued for the purpose. The bonds or loan could be met gradually from the revenues of the islands, while the proceeds of the land, which would sell readily, could be used to constitute a school fund. This object, if declared, would make the plan most popular, because the desire for education by the Filipinos of all tribes is very strong."

Whatever else we may say about this plan, no one can deny that it is most cleverly designed to detach from the opposition all those whom the friars' oppression and extortion had driven into revolt.

Nor will any student of this question overlook the Commission's wise policy in extending marked encouragement to the Federal party. The rapid growth of this organization since November promises to relieve the insular government of a difficult task, in supplying a counterpoise for the extremely hostile Katipunan society. At the beginning of 1901 the Commission was able to say that a strong peace party was organized, with the definite purpose of securing civil government "under the United States." The precise language of a despatch dated January 2 is worth recalling. Members of this peace party, it is stated, "reasonably expect civil government and relief for inevitable but annoying restraints of military rule. . . . Time near at hand, in our opinion, when disturbances existing can better be suppressed by native police of a civil government, with army as auxiliary force, than by continuance of complete military control."

Perhaps enough has been said to indicate the practical spirit with which such a body of civilians may enter upon their appointed work, accomplishing many things which could never be effected by force. It is self-evident, also, that such labors hold out the promise of the establishment of peace in the islands on a firmer basis, for the simple reason that it is founded in equity, as distinguished from the strict application of the law, in friendly concessions, and in conciliation. It would be easy to show Judge Taft and his associates taking up the principal grievances, one by one, and gaining the good will of the natives by efforts made in consultation with them for the removal of such long-standing causes of complaint; winning their confidence by freely admitting them to the deliberations of the Commission, "to suggest objections or amendments." But it is more in point to speak of their success in securing the allegiance of many towns for the American Government — a policy having the immediate effect of depriving the native forces of their chief support.

The coöperation of the natives, thus brought into play, made itself felt in two main directions: (1) it was the most important factor in bringing about captures and surrenders of firearms during January and February; and (2) it insured the cordial reception of the Commissioners at provincial capitals. The latter result is to be ascribed to the zeal of the Commission's *protégé*, the new Federal party, which has spread rapidly in all parts of the archipelago, "and is active and urgent in its advocacy of peace and in presenting the advantage of civil liberty under American sovereignty." During February the Commission organized five provincial governments — in Pampanga, Pangasinan, Tarlac, Bulacan and Bataan — everywhere receiving the enthusiastic support of local Federalists, and having the benefit of their assistance in the attempt to prove that new privileges of great value were being offered, and to explain the difference between military and civil government. There seems to be no doubt that the desired impression was very generally made, in Luzon, in the Visayan group and also in Mindanao, which were visited in March; the Commission establishing in each province such a form of government as seemed to be adapted to the intelligence of its inhabitants, with the understanding that some of the governments installed were to be superseded by better systems, in due time. We are told that numerous reports were received from distant garrisons, conveying expressions of the confidence which the natives were beginning to feel in the Americans, and congratulations on the work of the Commission. A correspondent cabled on April 1 that Geronimo, formerly an insurgent commander, in explanation of the increasing confidence felt by the people with respect to

the purposes of the Americans, asserted that "this has been caused by the action of the Philippine Commission." He declared that "wherever the Federal party plants the American banner, there the insurrection ends."

In the light of these facts; in view of the natives' deplorable misconception of the true character of our "hard-headed wearers of uniforms" — the best soldiers in the world, I think, but, by the same token, not the best diplomats; and in view of the revulsion of feeling which the pacific and tactful measures of the Taft Commission seem to have produced, let us read again the recent long lists of surrenders, overtures to surrender, and captures. Would these cheering events have been crowded together into a few weeks, or would they, rather, have been scattered through a period of years — the distressing "years of warfare" with which we were threatened last autumn — if the distinctive work of the Civil Commission had been less wisely planned? It is beyond dispute that the chief credit for some of the surrenders belongs to the Commission and its native sympathizers; even to the most interesting capture it would appear that they must have contributed in a minor degree.

The facts are not yet at hand which will enable us to form a definite opinion upon this subject, but we may note the bearing of circumstances mentioned in the official and press despatches already published. One of Aguinaldo's staff permitted important letters to fall into Gen. Funston's hands; Tagalog officers were available for service — for this particular service — against their former chief; the way lay open and unguarded for a six-days' march upon Aguinaldo's camp. There was a different story to tell when the chase led through the highlands of the northwestern provinces at the beginning of 1900, before the bitterness of resistance had been drawn off and the Filipino organization itself undermined so diplomatically.

I may be allowed a final suggestion in connection with the fact of very high importance referred to at the outset, the fact, namely, that a Civil Commission may be looked to for such achievements as those which I have briefly indicated, — for such man's work and practical peace-lover's work in countries harassed by war. The suggestion is, that in future, when such grave and complex problems shall present themselves, a leading rôle shall be assigned to able civilians representing the Government and co-operating with the army on the ground. There should be more reliance upon tactful conciliation and less upon coercion — and this from the very outset — to the end that wars may be shortened.

MARRION WILCOX.

THE RUSSIANS IN MANCHURIA.

IN writing these pages I have no intention of discussing the political question concerning Manchuria. I merely think that, once an armed conflict in the East is on the verge of breaking out on account of Manchuria, it is well worth knowing what Manchuria is, why the Russian Government tries to establish its rule over this portion of the Chinese Empire, what are its real interests there apart from a mere desire of increase of territory, and, consequently, to what length of sacrifice it may be ready to go in supporting its claims. As one of the pioneers of the Russian advance in Manchuria, and as a geographer whose speciality for the last thirty years has been to deal with these portions of Asia, I am going to answer these questions.

Speaking for myself, I regard it as one of the greatest misfortunes of the Russian nation that the Caucasus, the Trans-Caspian territory and Turkestan were ever annexed to Russia, and, still more, that the Russians entered, in 1856, the basin of the Amur, and took possession of the North Manchurian coast of the Pacific Ocean. Of course, there was quite a chain of historical circumstances which brought about this result; nevertheless, I cannot but regret that this annexation took place. With respect more particularly to the annexation of the Amur, which was accomplished in 1856–1859, immediately after the Crimean War, when the attack by the British on the Russian settlements on the coast of the Sea of Okhotsk and in Kamchatka resulted in a fear lest England would take possession of the Pacific coast of Manchuria — the Russian nation would have lost nothing, and would have won a good deal, if Count Muravioff-Amurskiy had *not* taken possession of the uninhabited wildernesses on the left bank of the Amur, and up the Usuri, down to Vladivostok.

No matter which nation — England, the United States, Germany, or Japan — might have taken hold of this portion of the Pacific littoral, the great bulk of the Russian nation would have been spared the considerable sacrifices which they have made for colonizing the wildernesses of the Amur. With the extent of these sacrifices I am acquainted, as I

saw them. Further, Siberia would only have been the winner from having at her Southern border a civilized nation, instead of the semi-wild Mongols, Solons, Daurs, and the like whom she has now — just as Canada is gaining immensely by having the United States for a neighbor. As to the military defence of the frontier, the Amur frontier and the Pacific ports of Russia are infinitely more difficult to protect than the frontier of Trans-Baikalia.

Statesmen of all nations will probably disagree with this "popular," but not "national," view of the matter. They have already pronounced that Muravioff's annexation of the Amur and his "taking for Russia a strong footing on the Pacific" were acts of wise statesmanship and of deep political foresight. But, then, geography also has its rights; and, as a geographer, I am bound to say that the power which holds the mostly uninhabitable left bank of the Amur and the absolutely uninhabitable portion of the Pacific coast between the mouth of the Amur and the Bay of Peter the Great (Vladivostok) must be naturally and forcibly driven to find the method of connecting Vladivostok with its Trans-Baikalian possessions by means of a direct line of communication, via Manchuria; because without such a connection Vladivostok and Port Arthur are worse than worthless. And, in order to establish that connection, Russia has to establish her power over a very large territory, her possession of which will be disputed and which, even if it be annexed to Russia, belongs to a different race, and never will be truly Russian.

The first steps of the Russians in Manchuria were made in 1864; and it so happened that the writer of these lines was among those who made them. However, the initiative of these first steps came, not from the Government, but from a number of Trans-Baikalian Cossacks.

Trade, not conquest, was its origin. Immense numbers of horses are bred by the Cossacks on the plains of the southeastern corner of Trans-Baikalia, and there is no market for them. The Cossacks knew that the middle Amur would be a good market for their horses; and they had learned from the Mongols that if one should go straight to the east, across Northern Manchuria, one would easily reach the middle Amur after a journey of 500 miles; while if the journey should be made on Russian territory, down the Argun and the Amur, it would require first an extremely difficult voyage on rafts for 500 miles down the rapids of the Argun River, and next 50 miles on boats, down the Amur. They consequently asked permission of the Governor-General to go across Manchuria, and only requested to have somebody who might help them in finding a route across the Great Khingan mountains. A topogra-

pher had taken, a few years before, that same route, but he was killed by the natives. I was offered to take the lead of the small trading caravans of Cossacks; and so we went, twelve unarmed men — I was disguised as a merchant, — starting from the very point where the Trans-Manchurian Railway now crosses the Russian frontier.

We found the road, reached without difficulty the insignificant town of Mergen, and next came to Aihun (the scene of the latest battles) and to Blagovyschensk, on the Amur, where all our horses and goods were sold at a profit. I hurried next to rejoin my commander, the Governor-General of Siberia, at the mouth of the Amur. He was delighted with the success of our adventure; and, partly under the influence of us, the younger people, he suddenly decided to send the same autumn a steamer up the great river of Manchuria, the Sungari, which had never before been navigated by a steamer, and which was quite unknown to Europeans. Colonel Tchernyaeff was placed at the head of this little expedition, to which the Russian Consul at Urga, M. Shishmareff, a doctor, M. Conradi, an astronomer, M. Usoltseff, two topographers, and myself belonged. The aim of the expedition was simply to explore the Sungari, and, if we should succeed in reaching Ghirin (or Kirin), the capital of one of the three provinces of Manchuria, to enter into direct communication with the Governor-General. We reached Ghirin, and returned home the same autumn, after having found that the great Manchurian river was navigable as far as Ghirin, situated at its head-waters.

Immense stretches of a high, cold, and marshy plateau; wide, sandy, and waterless plains on the middle Sungari, similar to those of the Eastern Gobi, and also inhabited by nomad Mongols only; great expanses of marshy lowlands on the lower Sungari, inundated during the period of the monsoon-rains; poverty and a hard struggle against an inclement nature; a thin population scattered along the rivers, in the deep valleys separated from each other by mountains thickly clothed with wood, in the Ghirin province — these are what we saw during those two journeys. Only a few fertile plains, one about Tsitsikar, on the Nonni River, and another between Mergen and Aihun, relieve the generally poor aspect of the territory. This is, in a few words, the general character of more than two-thirds of Manchuria. As to its northern portion, there are surely not so many as 1,000 hunting Tunguses and lumbermen scattered over the whole of the territory to the north of my Mergen route, *i.e.*, roughly speaking, to the north of the fifty-first degree of latitude. This first impression of the country has been fully confirmed since recent exploration. All Manchuria is now perfectly

well known; and it appears from Dr. Pozdnéeff's estimates, which are quite correct, that while Manchuria covers 375,000 square miles, *i.e.*, very little less than France and the German Empire taken together, its population, including the recent Chinese immigration, does not exceed 7,500,000 inhabitants. And even this population is chiefly concentrated in the south, on the Lao-ho River, in the vicinity of the Gulf of Lao-tong; the population of the Mukden province being 4,250,000, while the remaining 3,250,000 are scattered over the two other immense provinces of Manchuria — GHIRIN and TSITSIKAR (Hei-lung-tsian).

None of us could think at that time that Russia would ever try to establish her rule over Manchuria. The immense uninhabited stretches of high plateau land in the north are absolutely unavailable for agriculture; while the fertile and cultivable portions of Manchuria are already occupied by Chinese and Manchus, among whom Russian emigrants could never take a footing. As to the excellent forests of Manchuria, or its gold, coal and lead mines, Siberia is replete with mineral wealth of all sorts, which is not exploited simply from want of enterprise and knowledge, while the forests on the Amur are but slightly inferior to those of Manchuria. The lines of geological structure going from the southwest to the northeast, Russia has already within her dominions the very same plateaus and mountains which cover Manchuria. Why, then, should Russia try to take hold of Manchuria, and thus impose upon herself new and formidable sacrifices, without gaining any notable advantage in return? However, the rapid progress of the Trans-Siberian Railway, the sudden growth of Japan, and the German, Russian, and English occupation of ports in the Gulf of Pechili have entirely changed the conditions which prevailed in 1864.

Already at that time it was evident to most of us that the seizure by Muravioff of the left bank of the Amur and the Pacific littoral, down to Vladivostok, was *not* the rich acquisition which it had been said to be at the time. Muravioff's dreams of a new Russian United States growing up on the Pacific coast, and joining hands with the United States across the Pacific, could not be realized on account of the poverty of the territory he had taken possession of; and no sooner was it taken than the eyes of the new settlers were already turned farther southward. I do not speak of the fact that the Cossacks, settled along the left bank of the upper Amur, always find out that the right bank is the best, and consequently have their meadows, and occasionally their fields, on the right, or Chinese, bank, of the great Mississippi of the East. Such encroachments are of little importance.

Nor do I speak of the gold mines on the slopes of the Great Khingan, in Northern Manchuria, which were worked a few years ago by all sorts of runaways, who founded on the Zheltuga River the little republic so charmingly described in 1897 by Mr. George Kennan. Certainly, there is gold in the Manchurian mountains which fringe the border of the high plateau — but exactly the same mountains, equally rich in gold, run on Russian territory as well, on the upper Zeya, and yield fabulous returns of gold. There is, however, something much more important than the local encroachments just mentioned; namely, the absence on the left (Russian) bank of the Amur of wide fertile plains which might some day become the seat of a wealthy and numerous agricultural population. The consequence is that even now, forty-five years after the annexation, wheat and oats for Russian settlers, for the military, and for the Zeya gold mines, have to be bought every year in Manchuria.

When the Amur was taken possession of, there was no end to the descriptions of its wealth and beauties. "The vine grows wild, climbing on the trees; the forests of the lower Amur are the most beautiful in the world; the prairies can give food and wealth to millions of settlers." And this was true. The vine grows wild; the prairies are splendid, when they are not inundated in August during the monsoon period; and the virgin forests are not bad, although very much inferior to those of British Columbia. But neither the virgin forests nor the periodically inundated prairies could become the abodes of a numerous agricultural population; while the fertile plains really suitable for agriculture appear to be very limited in extent.

In its upper course, the Amur flows in a narrow valley which is excavated to the depth of from 1,000 to 2,000 feet in a high and cold plateau, so that the bottom only of this valley and of the valleys of the tributaries is suitable for agriculture. On the other side, in the great curve which the Amur describes southward in order to join the Sungari and the Usuri, it flows through low, periodically inundated prairies, entirely unsuitable for agriculture; while in its lower course there is no land to till except what is cleared from under extremely thick forests. The only two fertile belts in the Russian Amur dominions are a plain 250 miles wide and some 250 miles long, in the east of Blagovyschensk, and a plain of much smaller dimensions on the Suifun River, near Vladivostok. But even these two plains are separated from each other by a distance of about 600 miles, along the Usuri and the Amur, where only a chain of villages on the very banks of the two rivers can be maintained. If you ride ten or twenty miles away from the river,

you find nothing but a succession of low, marshy troughs, soaked with water, and separated from one another by low, unfertile hillocks, or impenetrable marshes on the banks of the Usuri, until you reach the stony, wood-clothed mountains.

The result is that Vladivostok has no hinterland, properly speaking. It is a port thrown out on the Pacific coast, very far from the regions where a thick Russian population can ever be settled. It is more than 600 miles from the Blagovyeschensk plains, and another 1,000 miles from the plains of Trans-Baikalia; and nothing but mere strings of villages could be kept up between the Pacific port and these two possible centres of a future population. This is what "the strong footing of Russia on the Pacific" comes to in reality.

And then came the Trans-Siberian Railway, which, it was evident, could *not* be built along the Amur. So long as it was built across the prairies of Western Siberia, similar to those of Winnipeg, and farther on across the high plains, similar to the "rolling prairie" of Calgary in Canada, there were no real difficulties in its construction, except in the number of large rivers which had to be crossed, or in the absence of stone and shingle in Western Siberia. Nay, even to the east of Lake Baikal, along the valley of the Uda and across Trans-Baikalia, there were no very serious difficulties in the way until the present terminus at Sryetensk was reached. But many years ago I already wrote that I could not understand how the railway could be continued beyond Sryetensk down to the Amur, nor how it could be built on the marshy stretch where the Amur is joined by the Sungari and the Usuri, without going into simply fabulous expenses which could never be recouped. The formidable Gazimur Mountains, through which the Shilka River has pierced a narrow gorge below Sryetensk, and the 200 miles of marshy ground inundated every year by a formidable river raising its level for twenty feet in a few days during the monsoon period — these obstacles could be overcome, but at what cost?

Of course, there exist no "impossibilities" for the modern railway engineer, if only he need not reckon what every yard of the railway will cost. But — why should this expenditure be made, when it was evident that the first 800 or 1,000 miles beyond Sryetensk and the 300 miles above Khabarovsk could *never* become the seat of a numerous population? I know well the banks of the Amur, and I fully remember even now the hardships I had to endure when I had to ride along them on horseback. Consequently, as soon as the Trans-Siberian Railway was begun, I wrote in England and in the United States that it most

probably would never be built beyond Sryetensk. To build such a costly railway, of such a length, across a region which will never be thickly inhabited, would simply have been foolish. In fact, speaking as a geographer, I must say that the only reasonable means for connecting Lake Baikal (Irkutsk) with the Pacific would be to build the railway across Mongolia, via Kiakhta, Urga, and Peking; and that the only possible way to connect Lake Baikal with Vladivostok is evidently across Manchuria — not because these are the shortest routes, but because a railway along the banks of the Amur, via Khabarovsk, would be absurd for the reasons just indicated.

As to the Trans-Manchurian railway — speaking again as a geographer only — its direction seems to be perfectly well chosen. It avoids the terrible Gazimur Range, by passing at its southern extremity; then it runs over the lower terrace of the plateau, which represents an undulating, naturally macadamized surface of so easy access that the Cos-sacks and myself crossed it with our two carts without any road. Next comes the crossing of the Great Khingan escarpment, which cannot be avoided, and offers no serious difficulties. The railway next reaches the fertile and populous plains of Tsitsikar; avoids the marshy lowlands of the lower Sungari; and crosses the highest of the three parallel chains which it must cross before reaching the Pacific, at a point where this mountain is pierced by the Sungari. Broadly speaking, a better direction could hardly have been chosen. This and the fact that Chinese laborers could be found in any number are the reasons why the building of this railway progressed so rapidly before the Boxer rising — far more rapidly indeed than was known to the Western press. Moreover, the railway had thousands of customers even before it was completed. In those portions of the line which were nearly ready for temporary traffic, crowds of Chinese and Manchus came to fill up the working-cars whenever a train started.

Seeing how rapidly this railway was built before the Boxer rising, it is easy to foretell that, if no new complications arise in the East, the Transcontinental Railway will be nearly ready in a couple of years. And as this railway is going to connect the naval port of Russia on the Pacific, Vladivostok, with, so to say, the mainland of Russia — its connection with the Amur region is no connection at all, as already mentioned, — it is evident that the Russian Government will not easily abandon its claims upon the control and the possession of the railway line. Even if Port Arthur were never taken by Russia, or were abandoned by her, the Russian Government would surely do its utmost to

hold, at least, this railway across Manchuria, even at the risk of being entangled in a war.

It is not generally known, but it is a fact, that even before the Boxer rising the Russian Government was already holding this railway line in a military way. Russian papers reported, indeed, that 3,600 soldiers and Cossacks were already quartered along the line when the Boxer movement began. It is thus evident that it was already the intention of the Russian Government to establish across Manchuria something similar to the line of communication which it has maintained for nearly forty or fifty years across Mongolia. I mean the caravan route and the telegraph line from Kiakhta to Peking, via Urga. Both run over Chinese territory, but both are practically in the hands of the Russian Government. The road is a Russian road running across Chinese territory. When I mentioned this fact lately to the well-known Belgian Professor of International Law, Dr. Ernest Nys, he remarked that such communications were known in international law in the first half of the nineteenth century as "military roads." Thus, to quote but one example, Prussia kept such a road across the Rhenish provinces previously to their annexation. Something similar will probably be the outcome of the present conflict. It would be foolish, indeed, for Japan to let herself be rushed into a war for the Manchurian Railroad, as it would be foolish for Russian statesmen not to recognize that one day or another Korea will be so thickly colonized by Japanese that it will be Japanese for all practical purposes. There lies the possibility of an understanding.

And yet I cannot but repeat that the interests pursued by Russian statesmen in the East are the interests of a military state, not those of the Russian nation. If Russia should abandon all her possessions on the Pacific — with which she cannot be connected otherwise than by keeping a "military road" across a territory which will never be Russian, but is sure to be more and more colonized by Chinese — this abandonment would spare to the nation enormous sacrifices; it would avoid the possibility of war entanglements in the East; and it would only strengthen the position of Russia against any possible invasion from the East. Fully granting the possibility of a militarily reformed China rushing some day, with its millions of men, against the Aryans, in which case Russia would be the first to support the shock, it is not in the Amur region and still less in Manchuria, but in Trans-Baikalia, amidst a thoroughly Russian population, that the first stand could be made against that invasion.

P. KROPOTKIN.

BONDS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AS AMERICAN INVESTMENTS.

THE increase of wealth in the United States within the last decade has largely diminished foreign ownership of our corporate securities. A further result of this accumulation of capital is the placing of certain foreign government loans in the American market. These present to our investors a new kind of security, and novel problems. It may be useful to dwell upon two or three aspects of the question, from both the public and the private point of view.

First, there are the ordinary, the surface considerations. When the money lender scrutinizes a loan, the character of the borrower goes far. His ability and prospects, his reputation for promptness, his moral character and business rating are important, as well as is the security which he offers. So it is with a state. If its credit is doubtful, the lender insists upon a specific security, like the lien upon Chinese customs. If its monetary standard is uncertain, the terms of payment will naturally specify the medium. If its good faith is doubted, a higher interest rate reflects that fact. But there are quite other questions than these, which both the investor and his government will do well to ask.

However, let us first try clearly to realize the distinction between a state in debt and an ordinary debtor. In the latter case there will be a definite security. In case of default this security may be taken by foreclosure or other process. No such right exists against a state, the nearest approach to it being in the rare cases where some specific form of revenue is pledged to the satisfaction of a particular loan or the interest due upon it. What the state gives as security for a loan is not a tangible asset, but its pledge of honor, of national reputation, of good faith.

There is a marked difference, also, between the remedies open to the two kinds of creditors, the one who lends to a foreign individual and the one who lends to a foreign state. The former can proceed single-handed against his debtor by judicial methods. A specific remedy is within his grasp. The latter, on the other hand, can only proceed diplomatically,

through his own government. He is thus doubly helpless, — because he has nothing specific to seize for the satisfaction of an acknowledged debt, and because, to set any remedy at work, he must first interest and then employ the delicate and uncertain agencies of the state department.

In theory the remedy is simple enough. Every bond sold by a state to a foreign investor is a contract. Default in payment of principal or interest is a violation of contract. The injured party is entitled to protection from his government. By assumption of his claim that government may make the case its own. Redress being denied, the final penalty for breach of an international obligation is war, if regard for its reputation and regard for its future borrowing capacity are insufficient. But in practice the mere statement of such a remedy is enough to show its insufficiency and absurdity. As a matter of policy, it could only be thought of as against a weaker power. As a matter of common sense, the cost of the remedy is enormously out of proportion to the amount of the wrong. So, in point of fact, redress in case of default in government bonds is very problematical.

There is another fact to be borne in mind. The act of a state in pledging its faith and credit is quite on a different plane from the act of an individual or corporation doing the same thing. Accordingly when one state borrows from the subjects of another, this other state must consider what relations other than those purely financial are involved. Thus it comes that there is always a double point of view to be preserved in considering the loans of one government placed under the jurisdiction of another, namely: (1) the political point of view — that which relates to the interests of the state itself; (2) the investors' point of view — that which regards the transaction as a matter purely of private interest. This offers a convenient division of the subject, though the two aspects cannot always be kept distinct.

First, in regard to government loans politically considered. Although a state will hardly undertake to control the investments of its subjects, it can further or hinder its fellow states in their borrowing operations; and here, in truth, its interests may be quite other than those of its investors. If the British Government, for instance, should desire to build up Japan as a buffer against the advance of Russia eastward, she might naturally make easy the path of that ambitious empire as a borrower in England. Then, though the needs and vicissitudes of war might hurt the English bondholders, the political interests of Britain would be served as a makeweight. Something like this has been going on in Turkey for a generation or more.

And so, conversely, one country may influence its capitalists to refuse credit to another, because to build up its credit would be to strengthen a possible enemy. Russia places no loans in England. Her borrowing of money and her political *rapprochement* are both with France. But it is an unsolved problem whether the ability to borrow is the result of alliance, or the desire to borrow is the cause of alliance. The reasons which may influence the placing of government loans from the political point of view are exceedingly varied; and as these are the sinews of war, both industrial and military, of a possible enemy, a despotic government must be tempted to control its subjects' lendings.

At the risk of seeming fanciful, let me illustrate, by the case of Russia, the complexity of the questions which may arise. The virgin wheat lands of Siberia make Russia a potential rival of ourselves in furnishing Europe with this staple. To buy Russian bonds, then, may mean to help the development of wheat-growing in Russia, by building railroads, and to lower the net price of wheat to the western farmer, so long as he has a surplus for export. And so the completion of the Siberian railway might bring Baku oil into competition with the American illuminant throughout Manchuria, or possibly a great part of China, where we now sell large quantities.

Neither state nor individual would oppose on such grounds as this the attempt of Russia to borrow here. But go a step farther. Russia is ambitious, powerful, despotic. Hers may be the only form of government adapted to the control and civilization of the half-savage Asiatic peoples. Nevertheless, the concentration of power, the military influence, the popular ignorance, and the need of ice-free harbors for commercial growth, have made Russia the great rival and foe of Britain in several parts of the world. Shall we, as a people, be encouraged to lend to Russia? Should we not be warned that in so doing we may be hurting our best friend, at least our best customer?

Such reasoning is dictated by caution, not by hostility. On the other hand, Great Britain might encourage Sweden to borrow, because Sweden's army system is too antiquated to be effective without expensive reorganization, and because Sweden is Russia's near neighbor. That would be the result of hostility rather than caution.

Even more aggressive is the financial facility furnished by a country to the rebels of another, such as that furnished by Britain to the Confederacy, by ourselves to the Cubans, and by Holland to the Boers. In all such cases a loan by the state itself would of course be the grossest breach of neutrality: only loans from individuals are lawful; yet the

sympathies of individuals and their readiness to help a popular cause against an unpopular mother country may easily be enlisted and directed by a state's influence.

Enough has been said to show the complex character which a government bond sold abroad may assume, ranging from assistance rendered a friend to a blow dealt in the face of an enemy. Aware of the difficulty, perhaps the danger, of incurring foreign debt, the state will try to borrow at home,—sometimes by making appeals to patriotism; at other times by offering favorable conditions as to taxes; perhaps by creating an artificial demand, as for United States bonds under the national banking system, or for German bonds as a compulsory reserve if foreign insurance companies wish to do business there. The fact of borrowing abroad, then, is rather a confession of poverty and of financial weakness, and needs explanation.

We have spoken hitherto of loans floated by states of the first class, whose desire to maintain their standing can usually be relied upon to prevent default, but which, if they should default, are too powerful to be constrained in any way against their will. Loans placed by minor states, while more apt to be free from any connection with those rivalries of world politics which have been hinted at, have characteristics of their own which objectively and subjectively may present difficulties. For one thing, political weakness is almost always synonymous with financial weakness, and does not attract the calculating friend who will bolster up the state's credit for his own sake. Then, both are synonymous with political instability. The power to collect duties and taxes goes before the ability to pay interest; but no one willingly pays taxes to a doubtful sovereign or government, so that an uncertain sovereignty means an uncertain debtor. Where revolutions are frequent and constitutions less influential than popular passion, we do not expect to find credit or to give it.

But as the United States grows in wealth and power, there may be a temptation to use both in advancing its claims to primacy on this continent. In such case the loan to the weak power means a club to threaten with or control with, for we must protect our subjects' interests. So Russia holds Persia in her grip. This view of the matter opens up to an unwholesome imagination a long vista of hypothetical interventions, intrigues, combinations, and collisions. We have had some experience already in pressing private claims against certain American republics. The European fashion is to speak with the mouth of cannon. If we lose patience and try this summary way of collecting our citizens'

credits, we shall have to consider the effect on our trade and the effect on our character. Both will suffer from a tendency to bully. Yet if we do not bully, but rather negotiate endlessly and arbitrate, it is to be feared that we shall get but little at the end of the road. Turkey knows, and has shown us, the new way of paying old debts.

However, it is not so much questions of political expediency and policy that I wish to discuss, as the interests of the average investor, in whose hands the promoter finally expects to leave his bond issue.

In placing the bonds of a foreign government, the convincing argument is that no state can afford to default, because it must needs borrow again. It is also true that, even in case of war with the creditor state, it cannot legally, and probably will not, confiscate its bonds, held by enemy subjects, as a war measure. There is, of course, much force in this view, though it has not always proved a sufficient deterrent. But it is not so much a question of default in interest as of stability of principal. A state's bonds fluctuate with its financial condition, and also with its political situation. No investor desires a drop in the value of his securities. If he buys the obligations of a foreign state, he will naturally study all the factors which are likely to affect their value. If the state in question is ambitious, aggressive, a military power, it is more likely to get into difficulties than an unambitious one. War will diminish the balance available for interest; it may cost part of the creditor's security, as happened to Spain in the loss of Cuba; in any case, the price of its bonds goes down. Even British consols have met with a considerable drop since the Boer war broke out. The various bond issues of a state have no settled priority other than the power of one set of creditors to collect sooner and more effectively than another set. Therefore, the other obligations of the borrower should be scrutinized. Here politics must enter. If Russia should press Turkey for payment of the indemnity set at San Stefano, the regular creditors might fare hardly.

The stability of the government is another matter for the investor to consider. In Great Britain, king succeeds queen without a financial tremor. But take the case of Mexico, where Diaz has proved a blessing, though a dictator. He has given his country a beneficial despotism. He is a man of over seventy. What will come after him, when the strong hand is relaxed, the Latin temperament finds expression, and the forces of liberalism and clericalism war together again? We watch the declining years of the Emperor of Austria, truly a father to his restless peoples, wondering what will come after him. We argue that Russia

cannot always escape the liberalizing movement which has left its mark upon other European states, and that, when liberalism does break loose, like a disease long repressed and striking inwards, the body politic will be racked and shaken mightily for the long suppression.

The feature of possible commercial rivalry already mentioned has its financial as well as its political side. If the manufacturers of this country see in Germany their most dangerous competitor, and anticipate from her government those checks upon trade which our tariff system has for so long invited, they certainly will not build up a rival's credit by buying its bonds. Industrial war, like any other kind of war, saps the credit of the power making it. One of the dangers involved in introducing China to civilization is the possibility that the patient, imitative, astute Chinese may undersell the world, when they shall have mastered the modern processes of production. Modern politics seems to have been resolved into a hunt for markets. But as the buyer follows his sympathies and prejudices, as well as his judgment, much more is needed to command success than the cheapness of a commodity or the door open to receive it.

These, then, are the major factors which the investor will consider before he lends to a state: the stability of its form of government; the probability of war; the likelihood of commercial conflict and rivalry. There are also minor factors. The rate of taxation will show whether additional burdens can easily be borne. The amount of outstanding indebtedness shows whether credit has already been freely used. A sinking-fund provision in non-progressive countries is a somewhat necessary insurance of ability to repay. The burden of militarism is a millstone about the neck of a state, which the investor will not lightly disregard. Since Italy joined the Dreibund, embarked upon colonial adventure in Africa, and made her army equal to the part she wished to play, her financial condition has suffered. And, lastly, the general impression which a people makes, of progressiveness or decadence, of having a future or merely of having a past, will be taken account of. Such questions as these, remote and complex though they may seem, are really but the equivalent of those which one asks as a matter of course in buying a railroad bond, for instance: the debt per mile; the surplus over operation for interest; the danger of competition; the rate per mile; and the character of the management.

There is an unpleasant point of resemblance between the two classes of bondholders just referred to, namely, in the helplessness of the minority holder, if default comes. The small investor has not enough at

stake to warrant the expense of a lawsuit; he has to take the crumbs which the reorganizer lets fall. So, too, the widow and the orphan, who have invested their all in Argentines or Peruvians, can hardly expect to interest a government in their behalf, and set the machinery of diplomacy at work. In both cases the right of protection is a legal question; the fact of protection, a question of policy; and the two are wide apart.

And now a few words in application of these rather dim and fragmentary principles. We are not yet so deeply committed that we cannot look at the subject dispassionately. And yet we have made a beginning. Somewhat recently there have been placed in this country loans of Germany, Great Britain, Sweden and Russia, all states with good credit. How are these and similar investments to be regarded?

If one believes that an irreconcilable clashing of interests will eventually bring Russia and Great Britain into conflict, it is certainly unwise to loan to both; one should refuse both, or else pick the one whose success would, on the whole, make for civilization and progress and our own trade expansion. If experience teaches anything, it is that certain of the Central and South American republics are unstable, and that collection from them is difficult. Therefore, one's risks in that quarter should be limited. The bonds of Sweden, an unambitious state, should be unquestionably good; the only cloud upon them being its possible separation from Norway, which would weaken the political position of both countries, and expose Sweden to Russian aggressiveness. Here Finland points a moral. In case of Russian control, however, the credit of Swedish bonds would be maintained; for, by international law, if one country takes over another it must take it subject to its liens. The bonds of Germany should be good also, but a trifle less attractive because of its exposed position between France and Russia, because of its heavy military burden (a drawback to the financial ability of France, Russia, and Italy likewise), and because of the possibility of commercial war with the United States.

A final remark is perhaps worth making. By their right of taxing their debt or interest thereon, foreign states have retained over their bonds held abroad a power, which might destroy values. This right should be surrendered before a loan is considered. If, in the future, states incline toward tariff rather than military wars, as is possible, we must expect a decided increase of, and ingenuity in, the forms of duty, coupled with any other method of taxation calculated to make the other party smart.

THEODORE S. WOOLSEY.

THE LIGHTING OF RAILWAY CARS.

IN the well-appointed passenger trains of to-day, travelling is a pleasure as compared with the tedious journeys of a few decades since. The railways are on the alert to meet the requirements of a discriminating public, not only caring for their safe and prompt transportation, but also catering to their demands for comfort and even luxury. A large part of travel must be done during hours of artificial lighting, especially by business men, who constitute the majority of passengers, and who wish to do their travelling as much as possible outside business hours. The problem of securing satisfactory light in the cars is therefore one of considerable importance.

In the early days, when people were accustomed to the light of flickering candles, no better light was desired on trains. At first the trips were short and were made only during the daylight hours. The first artificial lighting of railway cars began nearly three-quarters of a century ago, passengers sometimes furnishing their own candles or oil lamps on long journeys. Candles, furnished by the company and placed in convenient pockets, were gradually displaced by lamps burning animal, vegetable, or mineral oils. The oil lamp was developed until it gave quite a respectable light, although accompanied by disagreeable and expensive features, and the suspicion that fires in connection with wrecks were aggravated, if not caused, by oil lamps quite as often as by stoves.

As early as 1856, experiments were made on the Chicago and Galena Railway with the use of compressed city gas for car lighting. Coal gas loses much of its illuminating power when compressed, and has therefore been practically abandoned for train use. In 1867, Julius Pintsch, of Berlin, began experimenting with various gases, and found that gas made by heating oil to a high temperature would stand compression with little loss of illuminating power. He succeeded in building up a business of great magnitude. During the last few years, acetylene gas made from calcium carbide, a product of the electric furnace, has been applied to car lighting with more or less success. Incandescent electric lamps were first used for train lighting in 1881, and are now used in many of the best trains in all countries.

Each of the old methods of car lighting has certain features which are objectionable to the travelling public, to railway men, or to both. The first requirement in any satisfactory method is safety. The devices for burning oil and gas have been brought to a high stage of progress. Yet, with any illuminant requiring a flame, there is at least a possibility of fire risk. In the case of gas, there is the added possibility that pipes may become broken and allow the gas to escape and mingle with the air, until an explosive mixture is formed. The results of the explosion of such a mixture would not be pleasant to contemplate.

The worst features of oil and gas are the products of combustion. Oil and gas lights not only cause a large amount of heat, which adds to the discomfort of summer travel, but they use up the oxygen of the air faster than do the passengers. The products of combustion are generally carbonic acid gas, water vapor, and heat. When the lights do not burn properly, they may give off more or less of a poisonous gas known as carbon monoxide. The presence of the carbonic acid gas and of the water vapor has a tendency to make a person feel drowsy and dull. The water vapor adds to the discomfort by reducing the evaporation from the skin. A large part of the waste from the body is eliminated through the skin by insensible perspiration, the evaporation of which cools the body. As the air becomes saturated with water vapor, evaporation from the body diminishes, and one soon becomes hot, drowsy, and uncomfortable. The principal function of the fan is not so much to cool the air as to blow fresh air upon a person, and so increase the evaporation from the body, and thereby indirectly cool it. The electric fan in dining and parlor cars is a grateful luxury as it causes the air to circulate, even though it be warm, and thus continually brings near the skin air that is less fully saturated with moisture.

The degree of emphasis to be placed upon this consideration may be inferred from a few figures. For illuminating various kinds of American passenger cars, the light varies from the equivalent of that given by about forty candles to that given by 1,200 or 1,500 candles. The ordinary car has an illumination equal to that of about 170 candles. The consumption of oxygen and the products of combustion in the lamps giving that amount of light may be compared directly with the presence of a number of passengers; the candles being equal to about 115 adults, oil lamps being equal to about eighty adults, and gas being equal probably to about twenty-five adults. The above comparison makes no allowance for the additional discomfort of dirty lamps, which smoke and smell.

A great objection to the oil lamp is its liability to smoke; and another is its liability to leak oil on the carpets and upon the clothes or baggage of passengers. It was stated, several years ago, that it was costing the Pullman Company about \$200,000 annually to replace carpets and other furnishings injured by oil lamps; no record being available, however, of the damage to the property of passengers.

When the incandescent electric lamp approached a commercial form, in 1879, its advantages were quickly recognized. Experiments looking toward its use on railway cars were begun almost before the first central station for stationary lighting was in operation. In spite of the frailties of the early lamp and the limited sources of electricity then available, the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway in England began in November, 1881, to operate electrically lighted trains, and has continued this method of illumination until the present time, making improvements from time to time as experience dictated. Soon after this trial began, other roads, in nearly every country, followed; and to-day the number of cars lighted by electricity runs up into the tens of thousands, not counting the myriads of trolley cars, which are lighted and propelled from the same source of power. A history of the development of electric lighting for railway cars would make an interesting study for railway officials and others who desire to keep fully posted in this branch of electrical work.

As is generally known, the light of an incandescent electric lamp comes from a slender carbon filament in a vacuum maintained within a closed glass bulb; this filament being heated to a high temperature by an electric current. So little heat escapes to the outside that the lamp may be placed with safety in almost any location desired. There is no open flame which may set fire to combustibles near by, and the external temperature is so low that only actual contact for a considerable time will carbonize or ignite the most inflammable material. It heats the atmosphere to a very limited extent only, and does not vitiate it in the least, there being no combustion. The lamp may be lighted without a match by the simple turning of a key, and may be extinguished with equal facility and safety. With proper care on the part of those in charge, there will be no fluctuation in the light, neither streaks nor shadows. Experience has shown methods of construction and operation which make the electric light safe as a fire risk; and the voltage used is so low that it is impossible to receive a shock of any consequence.

When the electric berth lamp was introduced it met with instant success. A passenger who has enjoyed the luxury of a cool light at

his shoulder, available at any time during the night, without any disturbance, always seeks a sleeping-car with electric lights. The travelling public is satisfied with nothing less; and to-day no train can be called thoroughly modern and up-to-date unless it can advertise berth lights. The latter are electric, of course, for no other kind has appeared. Along with the berth lamp is the possibility of having electric fans to keep the air in circulation. Another advantage which appeals to ladies is the comfort of heating a curling-iron without the nuisance of an alcohol lamp, so trying and dangerous in the cramped quarters usually allowed for ladies' dressing-rooms. On trains equipped with storage batteries, each compartment and each dressing-room may be furnished with electric heaters, always ready for use by simply inserting the tongs.

Power for operating the electric lamps and other devices may be obtained from storage batteries carried underneath the car, from dynamos, or from a combination of the two. The storage battery consists of a number of lead plates immersed in diluted sulphuric acid. When a current is sent through the battery from an outside source, certain chemical changes take place, which make the plates electrically different; so that when the circuit is provided they will cause a current to flow through. There is no storage of electricity as such, the energy of the charging current being changed into chemical energy, which is stored and later is retransformed into electrical energy.

The dynamo, often called an electrical generator or a dynamo electric machine, is a device for changing mechanical energy into electrical energy; it is based upon the interrelations of electricity and magnetism. For train lighting, the dynamo is driven by a steam engine in the baggage car, or it is belted to the axle. For the engine-driven dynamo steam is obtained from the locomotive; and provision must be made for supplying light when the locomotive is changed at division points. There is likely to be some vibration from the engine throughout the train, which, however, is noticeable only when the train is standing still.

With the axle system provision must be made for lighting the train when standing and also when running at too low speed for the dynamo to operate. The storage battery furnishes the simplest means of supplying light at such times; suitable devices being arranged to transfer the lights from dynamo to battery or vice versa, as required. In connection with the axle-driven dynamos, the batteries are charged from the dynamo on the car, either while the lamps are lighted, or during the

day, or at both times. Batteries used as auxiliaries to engine-driven dynamos are charged either *en route* or at the terminals, while the train is being cleaned and inspected for the next trip. Batteries used for lighting without any dynamo on the train must be charged at the terminals of the road.

The choice of an electric-lighting system best adapted to a given train or to a given road involves a number of technical considerations which require careful investigation. It may be said in general, however, that the storage battery without any dynamo on the train is suitable for trains which are not more than one day away from a source of charging current; that the system of engine with dynamo in the baggage car is suitable for solid trains going through to their destination, without any changes in make-up; and that the axle-lighting system finds a field almost its own in the case of through trains on runs several thousand miles long, and on trains which are split up by having cars added or removed *en route*, while it can compete in point of economy and good service on trains for which the other systems are suitable.

Comparing the different sources of light, passengers prefer gas to oil, and electricity to gas, provided the electric lights are properly taken care of and are reliable. Since experiments with electric lights on trains have been made from the time when the electrical art was in an early stage of development, it is not surprising that some of the early attempts were not as conspicuously successful as they were expensive. The compressed-gas system was brought to a reliable and commercially successful stage ten years before the electric incandescent lamp was ready, and the gas interests made good use of their opportunity to preempt the field. After much expensive development, and in the face of many discouragements, the advocates of electric light for train use have overcome nearly all obstacles; and to-day the electric light is recognized as the only thing for the best service. The modern apparatus is developed to such a state of reliability and perfection that it is now possible for the railways to purchase electric-lighting outfits, or to secure them on a rental basis at moderate cost and guaranteed by ample capital. Now that the electric light has won its standing with the railways, the public may expect a rapid adoption of this admirable source of light and ventilation.

GEORGE D. SHEPARDSON.

THE NEGATIVE SIDE OF MODERN ATHLETICS.

ATHLETICS in school and college have in recent years received so much attention that no one can deny the need of considering their influence in connection with modern education. The subject has been largely discussed, sometimes with enthusiastic admiration, and sometimes with condemnation no less ardent. How much effect this talk has had it is not easy to say. Public opinion is seldom affected directly by argument; and until any popular fashion has run its course words seem to do little in modifying it. The partisan is apt to speak with too much force, the opposition with too great rancor; so that both more often provoke than convince. Argument in favor of the unpopular view is especially ungrateful, and is apt to seem completely ineffectual. Yet the negative side should be presented. This generation prides itself upon being guided rather by reason than by impulse, and it cannot consistently refuse to consider even unpalatable objections.

At a time when the general voice so strongly endorses the present fashion of conducting athletics, I therefore venture to state some possible doubts in regard to the part which sport has come to take in the lives and training of young men. Although my views may not be agreed to, they may at least suggest some fresh thought upon a subject which should be examined with patient and dispassionate attention.

The physical is continually, and, of course, with obvious truth, called the basis of mental growth. One of the doubts which I venture to put forward is whether this fact has not been made to bear more weight than it can fairly support. Few quotations have been more hopelessly over-worked than "*Mens sana in corpore sano.*" The nourishment of the mind by the development of the body was one of the dreams of the idealists at Brook Farm; but Hawthorne drily comments that when the work of the day was finished, these cultivated men, instead of discussing philosophy and poetry, leaned idly on the stye and poked the pigs. That a diseased body will warp the mind is conspicuously shown by the violence of dyspeptic Carlyle, the pessimism of bed-ridden Heine, or the sentimentalism of consumptive Mrs. Browning; yet the intellectual

results which these and others of their kind accomplished, the good that they did to society, will easily endure comparison with the work of most athletes. The line beyond which physical development cannot well go without injury to intellectual growth is probably to be drawn much nearer simple ordinary freedom from ill health than most theorists are willing to allow. The effective intellectual workers of the world thus far certainly seem to have been of no more than ordinary physical endowments or training. It is at least doubtful if bodily culture can be made an end without stunting mental vigor; and in these days we are face to face with the possibility, if not with the certainty, that the physical is being advanced at the risk of injury to intellectual well-being.

The overworked phrase just quoted, "*Mens sana in corpore sano*," seems in modern practice to have come to be translated, somewhat inaccurately: "A sound body necessarily makes a sound mind." Life would be greatly simplified if the understanding could be brought to perfection by training the body; but the method suggests that of the mad professor who proposed to teach students all languages by setting them to build a second tower of Babel. The sane mind responds normally and joyously to bodily health; but such is human weakness that it is too prone to go no farther, to satiate itself in the delight of physical content, and to sink into mental inanition which is entirely satisfied to do without intellectual advancement. The enjoyment of sport and of the excitement attending it has under present conditions not only to a large extent taken the place of mental recreation and mental exertion, but it has also so warped the minds of many of the rising generation as to render intellectual pleasure entirely unattractive. The college man of to-day, I believe, has often been turned away from literature and the inner life by a too great zeal for athletics. What is worse, the absorbing fascination of sport has, in some cases at least, seriously crippled even the appreciation of the delight of mental growth.

The constantly growing lack of the power of concentration and of intellectual manliness was the subject recently discussed by a conference of leading teachers in Boston; and the Principal of the Cambridge High School did not hesitate, if the newspapers report him correctly, to attribute the difficulty in a large measure to athletics. The sentiment is one which I have heard privately expressed by a good many teachers. It is not often said publicly, probably for the reason given by the head of one of the best fitting-schools in New England. "To say anything against athletics in the present craze," he declared, "does no good, and

would simply diminish my influence with the boys and their parents; so I hold my tongue."

How general is the sentiment I do not know; but I do know that it is the general experience at the Institute of Technology, with which I have the honor to be connected, that a boy's work suffers if he goes deeply into athletics. The practical, technical work of such an institution demands the first place in the interests of the student, and is not to be glossed over by cramming or forced effort. Such work is in a manner a fair, if a severe, test of the possibility of combining really serious mental discipline with any unusual degree of special physical training. Whatever may be true of an academic education—although I am not able to see why there should be any difference in the principle—a student in a technical school of high grade, in order to attain to success, must not only attend to his studies, but give to them the very first place in his interest. It is my belief, and my experience as far as this goes, that the work done by students deep in athletics, while it may be conscientious, is seldom of the best or the most lasting quality. Exceptions there may be, and I am aware with what vehemence the statement would be denied by the partisans of modern athletics; yet, on the whole, I am convinced that what I have advanced is substantially true.

An incident which happened to me a few years ago will perhaps make more clear what I have in mind. It is one of a number which might be given; but it chances to be particularly apposite. Coming from the West, I shared a section with a well-built, well-dressed young man, apparently between twenty-five and thirty. He had a wholesome, manly face, evident good breeding, and a personality at once attractive. In the middle of the first forenoon, as we sat opposite, he said without preface: "I beg pardon, but I should like to ask you a question." "Well?" I responded. "How shall I learn to like to read?" he asked, with a seriousness evidently real. Then, in answer to my look, which probably showed my surprise at such a question from a complete stranger, he added: "I saw your name on your bag. I never read any of your books, but I've seen them on my father's table, and I thought that you might help me."

He went on, in answer to my questions, to tell me his experience. He had been brought up in a cultivated family, and by a father fond of books. In fitting-school and in college he had gone deeply into sports, playing first on the 'varsity base-ball nine and later on the eleven. The intoxication of physical exertion and the strong delight in athletic competition—that personal struggle which calls out the most subtle refine-

ments of human vanity — took upon him that hold which they inevitably take upon a normal and manly boy. He stood well in his classes; indeed, he said, in naive unconsciousness of the scale of relative values he was establishing, it would not have been fair to the team not to stand well in his classes. By little and little the old intellectual life to which he had been bred became cold and tame, and then slipped away from attention altogether. He said in substance:

"Of course, I thought nothing of it at the time; but looking back I see now that we really had nothing in mind but athletics. We talked of the games beforehand, estimated chances, discussed the teams we were to meet — all that sort of thing was necessarily part of it, you know. Then after the games we went over them point by point, and talked of the different men and the newspaper reports. I can see now that I wasn't really alive to anything but athletics all the time I was in college. I couldn't to-day pass an examination on any of the things I stood well in, but I could tell you the details of every game I played. After I graduated, I was sent to a country town to a factory my father owns, and there I'm learning the business. There's no society, and I made up my mind to do a lot of reading. I knew I could never be the sort of man I want to be, the sort of gentleman my father is, without the help of books. I've been at it a couple of years, and I've waded through a lot of first-class things. They only bore me. I really care only for the newspapers, and in those I always read the sporting news first. Then I take a book, and go to sleep over it, and hate myself."

I do not pretend that I have reproduced his words literally; but I am not far from this, because the matter made so strong an impression on me. I have told the incident somewhat at length, because I felt then and I feel now that the case was one typical of a large class. It is typical, too, not only of the effect upon students who are actually on the teams, but to a great extent of the whole college fraternity as far as they are interested in athletics as at present conducted. It shows how it is at least possible for absorption in sport to swallow up higher interests.

The notoriety attending any close connection with sports helps to foster this too great absorption in them, and it has an effect perhaps worse in tending to develop a vulgar appetite for cheap sensationalism. The newspaper gossip, the pictures, and the personal details about members of school and college teams, are about as unwholesome as anything which could come to lads in their student days, and the more so from the fact that these are entirely without relation to any intellectual merit or effect. "Notoriety," Kipling has said, "is a windy diet for a young colt"; and the image, if not overrefined, is shrewdly just. The boy who, as the phrase goes, has been "written up," who has seen his picture shining through a haze of sham glory and smudgy printing in the Sunday newspapers, may by innate manliness and native modesty escape unbearable

conceit; but he cannot avoid coming to look with tolerance on the offensive personalities of modern journalism, and he would be rather more than human if he escaped without some distortion of standards.

The English have certainly less excess in this matter than the Americans. An Oxford man said to me last summer: "But, you know, in American colleges the whole feeling about sport is what we consider a professional one": and few would be inclined to deny, I think, that there is more moderation and a better sporting spirit among English than among American undergraduates. Yet the London "*Spectator*" has declared that the army is going to ruin because its officers are at school spoiled by "the prevalence of what may be called the playing-fields fallacy," and that nothing can be improved so long as the English parent "puts skill in games far above general intelligence and culture as a qualification for a commission." The London "*Times*," in a leading article, says that before the public schools can be held qualified to train men to be good officers it must be shown "that the reproach of training boys to care for nothing but sport, and fostering in them no habits of industry, is a malicious libel." If there be any justice in such strictures on the other side of the water, what shall be said of our schools and colleges where athletics are carried so much farther?

The feature which most markedly distinguishes modern athletics from those of the days of our fathers, however, is not the present elaboration, the extravagance with which everything is done, not even the publicity; it is the part which by incitement and by support is taken by adults. The encouragement given to sports by men long out of college, men of affairs and so of standing in the world, is the most peculiar and characteristic of the influences which affect undergraduate athletics. It is, perhaps, not too much to say that this attitude of men of consideration toward college and school sports is at present the influence most effective upon student life, and certainly it is the most important of all outside forces. This seems to me to be the chief cause of whatever in the present condition of things is undesirable.

That the impulse and enthusiasm of youth should be restrained by the cooler judgment of age is perhaps an antiquated notion, but it is none the less a wise one. The inclinations which in boys are entirely natural and wholesome are often those which most need to be restrained and subdued, if a broad and sound development is to result. The natural tendency of the young toward physical enjoyment needs no spur. It should rather be tempered by the broader and deeper perception of those old enough to realize that, while sport must have a part in every well-

balanced education, it very easily slips into excess, and consequently into evil.

The attention given to-day by adults to sports has thrown things out of proportion. Students are likely from natural impulse to give to sport a sufficient emphasis; and the result of present conditions is that young folk inevitably, even if only half-consciously, come to overestimate the value of physical training in education. Sport is the one thing in college life which at the present time awakens enthusiasm outside, and it is impossible that this fact should be without effect. The thousands crowding to an intercollegiate game arouse every fibre in the young and responsive collegian and set him a-tingle with excitement. Nothing connected with the intellectual side of education is reinforced by outside interest in this way. The general public cares so little, for instance, for the intercollegiate debates as hardly to know which side wins. A debate is not an especially seductive form of recreation, but it is the one public event of rivalry between universities on intellectual grounds; and if any genuine interest in this side of college life existed in the people at large, some sign might be expected here. By actions, which are everywhere so much more effective than professions or protestations, the public, and the educated and cultivated portion of the public in particular, say to the undergraduate that athletics are of more consequence than anything else in a college career. It does not seem possible that under such a state of things the student's sense of values can escape distortion.

This distortion of values is fostered, moreover, by the character of modern sports. The claim that they develop pluck and produce a gain in self-control and responsiveness is undoubtedly well founded. No one could for an instant deny the worth of these things: the question at issue is whether they are not perhaps in this instance purchased at too high a price. There are times in every noble life when the cool calculation of chances is the most contemptible cowardice; but the man who is a hero differs from the man who is merely rash or foolhardy largely in virtue of his power to distinguish the real worth of a cause. The man who encounters great peril for trifles has always and properly been held to have but an ill-balanced mind.

In modern athletics the comparison between the gravity of the risk and the value of the result is such as to warp the judgment. I have no intention of bringing up the question of the brutality of foot-ball, or the horrors of the dressing-rooms at a modern athletic meet. These things are known sufficiently, and the advocate of athletics is forced to accept

them as necessary evils, but evils not great enough to counterbalance the good which he believes to result on the whole. In face of fact, however, no one can deny that the risks are possibly of the most grave. The New York papers last autumn published a list of some dozen fatal accidents on the inter-scholastic foot-ball field for the season; and whether this particular list be authentic or not, there have certainly been deaths enough from foot-ball accidents to give pause to those not either thoughtless or convinced that the end justifies the danger. For a youth to be trained to run this risk for mere sport is not likely to help him to a just perception of comparative worth; and so far as it influences his character, it would logically seem likely to make him rather rash than brave, rather foolhardy than heroic. He might be ready in the heroic moment; but the heroic moments are rare in ordinary life, and the opportunities for impetuosity and rash folly are numerous. This may seem somewhat extravagant, because the danger of fatal catastrophes on the athletic field is seldom realized; and it is generally held that the players do not believe in them or they would not play. Young and ardent lads will run any risk and enter upon any foolhardy enterprise, if they are sufficiently spurred on by the encouragement and applause of their elders; and, moreover, they do realize these things when outside of the actual excitement of play. The risks exist, and I have known more than one instance in which a man on a school or college team has felt himself to be by public opinion blackmailed into participation in a game which he regarded as dangerous to the last degree. Certainly, to be praised and lauded for running such risks as are admitted, when the stake is what it is, cannot help a youth to just appreciation of real and relative values.

Undergraduates are generally a pretty shrewd set. They are at the least conventional period of life, and they are very little likely to be deceived by conventional professions. They may at first be imposed upon by the glib assurance that their elders encourage athletic contests from pure interest in the well-being of youth and a noble and self-sacrificing desire to promote their higher education; but they are too shrewd not to perceive the spirit in which the sports are witnessed, and to appreciate the exact quality of that zest. The student understands the men who are genuine in their support, and who are actuated in their generous aid to athletics by a real faith in them: no less does he realize perfectly that the tens of thousands of spectators who rush to a foot-ball game come together in the same mood in which they would crowd to a bull-fight. He comprehends that the multitude is assembled by the love of amusement.

The college serves as an agreeable background for personal preferences and exciting rivalries of talk or of bets. But the college on the field of sports touches nobody as an intellectual ideal: in that atmosphere it does not shine forth as an *alma mater* of mental nourishment or of higher aspirations. Every college student realizes this with the unwinking clearness which is characteristic of these unreverential days. He sometimes says plainly that the crowd do not care for the risks of the player, if they can have their fun; although, as a rule, this side of the matter, if it comes to his thought, seldom finds its way to his lips, lest he be suspected of flinching. He does not fail to believe the men who with so evident sincerity and zeal declare their belief that athletics are of high value in education; he respects their genuineness and shares their views. Neither does he fail to comprehend, however, that if college athletics depended for support upon interest in education they would come quickly to a starveling end. The support of the public, despite whatever eloquent speeches are made to the contrary, the undergraduate knows to depend absolutely upon the extent to which the public is entertained.

The leading educational institutions of the country are precisely those places where this spirit of excitement and amusement at any cost is most strongly felt. The indifference of people in general to intellectual concerns and their greed for amusement are thus burned into boys at the most impressionable period of life, and that, too, under the sanction of the very universities of which the highest function should be that of nourishing the intellectual ideal.

The intellectual standards of any civilized land are obviously the measure of its permanent advance. They are established, not by the many, but by the few; and the few, the leaders of the higher thought, have a right to claim from a university its best support and coöperation. The university which simply fits men for utilitarian ends is false to its best uses; and still more is it unworthy if it instil or foster material or degraded views of life. The university has a duty to the nation which is not less than that which it owes to the individual student. Personally, I find it impossible not to feel that the prominence given at American universities and schools to athletics is a menace to their influence for good to the public or to students. The intellectual ideal may not have been abandoned or degraded; it most certainly has been obscured.

The effect upon the universities which has been brought about by modern athletics is more grave, because more far-reaching, than any immediate effect upon individuals. The well-being of the student is a serious matter, but it is, after all, of less real consequence than any vital

deterioration in the character of institutions of learning. One cause cannot be entirely disentangled from another in considering the modifications which come about in complicated modern social conditions; but it is not impossible to distinguish at least the tendency of the present exaltation of sport. Social prominence in colleges to-day is so largely dependent upon physical prowess that whatever power scholarship should have in this direction has been much discredited. The institutions which are nominally the conservators of the intellectual ideals of the nation introduce students into a society where intellectual distinctions have sunk into a secondary place. Instead of being four years in an atmosphere of learning and of mind, the youth is during his college course constantly impressed through his surroundings with the idea that success is to be won rather by the body than by the mind; that popularity is of more effect than culture; and that learning may be disregarded for more showy and ephemeral accomplishments.

This unfortunate condition of things is more firmly established by the class of students attracted to college by the fame of athletic victories. The day that a university receives a single student who has been brought there by its record in the field it weakens its intellectual standing; and to-day it is difficult not to feel that not only have our leading universities taken in many such men, but that they have deliberately counted upon this means of increasing their numbers. In so far as a college is not responsible for such students, it suffers a misfortune in their coming; in so far as the college, directly or indirectly, is responsible, it has been false to the principles on which institutions of learning are founded; it has been guilty of sacrificing to present and fallacious appearances of prosperity its real and lasting efficiency.

The grave matter of the moral effect of college athletics on individuals I touch upon with reluctance; and I have no hesitation in confessing that it is a point about which I neither feel clear nor qualified to speak conclusively. That, during training, men are kept from dissipation is insisted upon constantly, somewhat as if it were fair to assume that they would necessarily be dissolute if left to themselves. Physically they are perhaps as often injured by overtraining as under other circumstances they would be by vice; but it would be unfair not to recognize that the rectitude is good, no matter how it is promoted. To some extent, in individual cases, it is balanced by the excesses with which men "break training"; but, on the whole, the influence of self-restraint cannot but be beneficial. The fact that men in training are excused from drinking at clubs has introduced to some extent a decline in the

old, silly and tyrannous habit of forcing by college opinion the acceptance of "treats," and doubtless has diminished the habit of drinking. What is of more importance, the prevalence of out-door sport has done much to make the whole rising generation clean-minded.

These things are not to be passed over lightly; but they are, in the first place, advantages which need not be diminished if athletics were kept within proper bounds; and they are only remotely inspired by those ideas of moral responsibility which have in the past been universally regarded as the foundations of real ethical strength. The excesses in drinking, in gambling, and in general debauchery, which have accompanied intercollegiate games, have created a good deal of scandal. They are said to be less flagrant than formerly, but it is not likely that they will disappear so long as the occasion remains.

The influence upon character of becoming responsible to a trainer first, and to constituted authority only secondarily, certainly seems of doubtful merit; and of graver, because more insidious, effect is that of accepting support in athletic expenses to be repaid in public exhibitions. As a writer in "The College" puts it, when a man gets on a team "his classmates pay to make him so skilful that by and by they may pay to see him." A student who would resent with fine indignation any proposal that an association of his fellows should bear the cost of any intellectual training has apparently no scruples about allowing the same thing to be done when his bills are for physical development. The scandals which have arisen at the keeping of men in school or college simply to help on the teams are largely things of the past, since here, at least, public opinion has stimulated the somewhat sluggish college consciousness into a perception of advisability, if not of honor. The nearest that I have ever been able to come to a conclusion in this delicate question is that athletics properly conducted are advantageous to college morals, but that the present method of conducting them introduces evils which at best go far to counterbalance this good.

In all that I have said I have been trying to deal with things as they are, and I have consequently avoided touching upon what might or should be. It is not my place here to dwell upon the brighter side, because this has already been so strongly insisted upon that an article such as this is meant merely to arouse thought of possible drawbacks. No sane man can shut his eyes to the substantial advantages which belong to the development of the physical side of youth; and certainly I have no desire, as I believe that I have no inclination, to underrate them. The whole question, as I have suggested, is that of deciding whether

the obvious benefits are worth what is now paid for them, and of seeing whether what is really good is not possible without what seem to be unequivocal evils. Life is a sharp huckster, and exacts the price to the last farthing.

Too much attention has been paid to what is gained in modern athletics, and not enough to what is lost. The true benefactor of the universities to-day, and through them to the community at large, must be he who would use his influence to arouse and to foster intellectual ideals, who would set himself deliberately and effectively against the overvaluation of the physical, and do his part to recall the universities to their great office of correcting the materialistic tendencies of the age. Where is the country to look for the generating and nourishing of intellectual impulse if not to the educated classes? And how is this to come about if education means athletics first and mental good afterward?

Whatever be true of cultivated men to-day, to the general public the college has come to be so largely identified with sport as to represent ideals rather physical than scholarly. Even if unfounded, such an impression would be a misfortune from its influence in degrading popular standards. When public sympathy and interest have been brought to the point of appreciating and enjoying the intellectual side of college life and effort, athletics may be magnified with comparatively little danger of evil consequences. At present, enthusiasm for bodily training has so distorted and maimed the whole system of education that, at the obvious risk of offending and of seeming extravagant, I cannot refrain from closing with the deliberate expression of the conviction that athletics is in education to-day the most serious obstacle to the advancement of intellectual growth.

ARLO BATES.

EVENTS OF THE DRAMATIC SEASON.

THE revival of "Henry V" by Richard Mansfield, and the production of "L'Aiglon" were decidedly the leading events of the dramatic season of 1900-01. Croakers who are continually bewailing the decadence of the American stage should be able to find some consolation when the main honors of a theatrical season are divided between Shakspere and Rostand, the latter of whom seems destined to be the Shakspere of France.

Mansfield's revival of "Henry V" disposed of the "brainless Apollo" view of this Shaksperian "historie," which had prevailed since its prosperous run at Booth's Theatre, a quarter of a century ago, with George Rignold as King Henry. Rignold was an Apollo, and little else. Consequently, "Henry V" was put down as requiring a spectacular setting, a handsome Harry — and that was all. That in it there were possibilities for an actor of ripe intellect and unusual power of expression was lost sight of. From this point of view Mr. Mansfield's revival came as a revelation.

Nothing finer, more artistic, or more complete, as a series of stage pictures, has been seen here. Mr. Mansfield's fine assumption of the title rôle and his drilling of his company made the drama itself stand out prominently from the spectacular environment. Superb as was the spectacle, it was without sacrifice of the dramatic movement. Even the climax of the most brilliant scene, the greeting of King Henry by the populace on his entry into London, after Agincourt, was not smothered in spectacle. The sudden forward rush of the people, with a mighty shout of acclaim seeming so spontaneous that it fairly carried the audience off its feet, was distinctly a dramatic moment. Yet, with its waving banners, flashing armor, and jubilant crowd, it was one of the most gorgeous spectacles ever presented upon the stage. It was a study in how to make a spectacle thrillingly dramatic.

The actor's reading of the lines betrayed the scholar and the man of action. The stirring speech beginning "Once more into the breach," and ending "With God, for Harry, England and St. George," was robust and vital with action, as was also the St. Crispin Day speech before Agin-

court. Yet the subtle soliloquy on the emptiness of kingship was given with a finesse which drew the audience into the very woof of Shakspere's thought. In looks, Mr. Mansfield was the character to the life; not an empty-headed Apollo, but a robust, picturesque English soldier-king.

To have succeeded in demonstrating the dramatic qualities of "Henry V" is a great triumph, because the drama had to play through spectacle. Moreover, there is no love episode to interest the average theatre-goer until nearly the end of the play; although to us, of the inner circle, who are accustomed to wait more than three mortal — or, rather, immortal — hours for our "Siegfried" Brünnhildes, that does not make so much difference.

I am quite willing to admit that I am an ultra-enthusiast over Rostand. It is like being charged with too great admiration of Shakspere. Either accusation honors the accused. One has but to look at Rostand's portrait to realize that he is a genius, and a serious one. The innate refinement, delicacy, and poetry expressed in his features preclude the possibility that he should ever stoop to anything unworthy of the gifts which nature seems to have lavished upon him. His two plays which have been produced in this country, "Cyrano" and "L'Aiglon," are of equal power, though wholly dissimilar in subject. In the earlier play, an eccentric, yet brave, lovable, self-sacrificing, French literary character of the eighteenth century — almost forgotten even in his own country — has been revived and immortalized by the young dramatist. In "L'Aiglon" we have a modern Hamlet, the youthful and attractive scion of an imperial house, the son of the great Napoleon, fired with ambition to regain his heritage, yet at the critical moment doubting his own power, and forever losing the opportunity to a throne.

The meeting of the conspirators with this Eaglet, on the desolate field of Wagram — what a masterpiece it is in picture, action, and language! The low, rolling, barren country in the pale, cold moonlight; the dim figures of the conspirators; facing them the slender and pitiful presence of the consumptive whom they are to follow to France and a throne; back of him the tall old grenadier of the guards, faithful Flambeau, who, as he once fought for the father, now watches over the son — this is what the eye sees. But to the mind even the picture already conveys the sense of impending failure. You feel an inevitable conviction that from these weird and ghostly surroundings the Eaglet, who had vainly been beating his wings against the barriers of diplomacy, never will soar away an imperial eagle.

But the fatal hesitancy, and the arrival of the Austrian secret agents in time to avert the dash for France, do not form the climax of the act. That is reached in a far different way. Unwilling to become a prisoner of Austria, Flambeau, the grizzled veteran of many wars, fatally stabs himself. The other conspirators are led away. The Eaglet alone remains with the dying grenadier on the battlefield of Wagram. A storm rises. In the soughing of the winds, mingled with the groans of the dying Flambeau, the prince seems to hear the moans and shrieks of the wounded and dying in the great battle his father fought and won on this very field. Visions of the dead rise before him like accusing shapes. He feels the consumptive damp upon his brow. Yes, he, this pale, pitiful, and death-devoted form, is the atonement for the slaughter of the Napoleonic wars.

. . . I am the expiation.
All was not paid, and I complete the price.
'Twas fated I should seek his battle-field,
And here, above the multitudinous dead,
Be the white victim. . . .
Wagram, behold me! Ransom of old days,
Son, offered for, alas! how many sons.
Above the dreadful haze wherein thou stirrest,
Uplift me, Wagram, in thy scarlet hands!

The sounds of battle increase with the rising wind. In wild delirium the Eaglet draws his sword. Suddenly, as day breaks, the imaginary din of combat is merged in the strains of a military band. He sees Austrian soldiers, France's enemies at Wagram, coming up the road. Beside himself, and shouting commands to imaginary grenadiers, he rushes at the first ranks of the Austrians. An officer parries his sword, exclaiming, "For God's sake, Prince! This is your regiment." It is true. Before the Eaglet knew that the conspirators were to meet at Wagram, he had ordered his regiment there at dawn for drill. The spell is broken, the delirium is over. The Eaglet, raising his sword and looking toward the cold, stiff body of Flambeau, commands, "Salute the dead."

This scene is masterly in conception and flawless in execution. The picture is supplemented by word and action; the word, by action and picture; the action, by picture and word. It is developed by a dramatic genius who knows the value of a scenic setting in keeping with the impression to be made by what is to occur; of action which seems to grow out of the picture; and of dialogue which harmonizes with both. Yet, this is but the greatest of several great scenes in "L'Aiglon." As in "Henry V," love interest is almost wholly lacking in this Rostand

play. But it is not needed. Attention is concentrated upon the Eaglet, upon whose frail shoulders rest the fate of a dynasty and the future of a nation; and who elicits, not the admiration lavished on a strenuous hero, but the tribute of sympathy, pity, and tears. The imperial purple was not for the Eaglet; he hardly belongs to history; he was almost forgotten; but now he will be wept over for many a day, since Rostand has recreated him as he recreated Cyrano.

"*L'Aiglon*" was acted in English by Maude Adams, under Charles Frohman's management. It was a long stride from Scotland to Schönbrunn, from Lady Babbie to the Eaglet. Miss Adams, however, successfully stepped from one character into the other, and made a great advance in her art and in her reputation. To shine in a rôle written for the great Bernhardt, and in the opinion of many to appeal more strongly in it than the creator of the rôle herself, certainly was a triumph for the young American actress. Comparisons are ungracious; yet I cannot refrain from saying that personally I prefer the Eaglet of Maude Adams to that of Sarah Bernhardt. The wan, pitiful figure which Miss Adams makes in the rôle is in itself appealing; and, all through the play, Miss Adams' portrayal — by very reason possibly of her physical limitations — is the brave soul dying in a frail body. Mme. Bernhardt's performance is superb; Miss Adams' is not. It is not a performance at all; it is the Eaglet.

The return of Mme. Bernhardt to America, bringing M. Coquelin in her train, was the great exoteric event of the dramatic season of 1900–01. They made their first public appearance together in the Garden Theatre, New York, on October 27. The play was Rostand's "*L'Aiglon*," already seen here in translation — for Miss Adams' production at the Knickerbocker preceded that in French — but now for the first time produced in the original.

As the Bonaparte Eaglet, caged and beating his breast against the bars, Mme. Bernhardt gave a performance full of passion and power, but, for these very attributes, lacking the pathetic note. She simulated the boy with extraordinary success. Her masculinity was not a mere matter of exchanging petticoats for trousers. With the trousers she seemed to assume the sex to which they belonged. Especially was the idea of youth — wilful, fretful, eager, ardent, emotional youth — conveyed by action, accent, and attitude. She was a boy in her exultation as in her despair, in her loves as in her hates. No other rôle has afforded to Mme. Bernhardt so great an opportunity for displaying the range and variety of her marvellous gifts. Yet it was a performance — not a complete

merger of self in character; for in appearance she was too tall and too robust for the physical weakling. M. Coquelin scored a triumph in his thoroughly artistic and convincing embodiment of *Flambeau*, the loyal, valiant, and chivalric veteran of Napoleonic wars.

M. Coquelin was, in fact, greater as *Flambeau* than as *Cyrano*. Yet that, too, was a fine performance. The part is one that might easily lend itself to caricature; indeed, it had tempted other excellent actors to at least the border-line of caricature. But in all his moods as swash-buckler, braggart, lover, friend, wit, and hero, M. Coquelin's *Cyrano* never forgot his personal dignity. He was poet first and humorist afterward. His very humor, indeed, was pregnant with poetry. Nevertheless, I prefer Mansfield in this rôle. He looks it more to the life, besides more fully mastering its pathetic opportunities.

Mme. Bernhardt had little to do in "*Cyrano*." M. Coquelin had even less in the production of "*Hamlet*." He was originally cast for Polonius, but gave up the part because he said he could not understand it, and took instead that of the First Grave-digger. In this he presented a little sketch full of the charm and detail of Meissonier. But it was likewise as French as Meissonier. He was a French peasant to the life, not an English yokel.

Curiosity had been piqued by the expected *Hamlet* of Sarah Bernhardt. It was curiosity rather than the artistic sense which was satisfied by it. Mme. Bernhardt's make-up was good, her bearing gallant, her elocution admirable. But the masculinity she had assumed with the pantaloons somehow disappeared in doublet and hose. Her *Hamlet* was essentially feminine, not so much in externals as in spirit. Vindictiveness, a shrill vixenish spite, was its dominant note. This appeared especially in the play scene, where her movements were cat-like in their malignity, and in the subsequent scene where Hamlet catches his uncle at prayers, starts to slay him, and then seizes the first pretence for hesitation—the fear that he may send him to heaven. Doubtless, Shakspere here meant only to emphasize the irresolution of *Hamlet's* character. Mme. Bernhardt uses the incident to emphasize the vindictiveness which she attributes to him.

Mme. Bernhardt's *Hamlet* misses the Gothic gloom and the poetic glamor which hangs around the Danish Prince. He is a garrulous Latin, not a reticent Teuton. He plucks out the heart of his own mystery, and exhibits it to the audience. Absolutely sane, he puts on an antic disposition to work out his own ends. In this respect, Mr. Sothern, whose *Hamlet* was an earlier event of the American season, agrees with Mme.

Bernhardt. But his disagreement on other points is so wide that he originally left out the prayer scene because he thought — wrongly enough — that it placed Hamlet in a cruel and repellent light. This very fact is a clew to his chief error, — a failure to understand the peculiar irresolution of Hamlet's character, an irresolution due not to weakness, but to a many-sided vision. Nevertheless, Mr. Sothern's Hamlet was a notable event. It was careful, conscientious, and scholarly. Indeed, the Hamlet production marked a decided advance in Mr. Sothern's art. Like his "Sunken Bell," it indicated a tendency to turn from the fol-de-rol of modern romances to the serious masterpieces of the stage. Such an inclination on the part of a young and accomplished actor, who inherits a noted name, should be encouraged in every legitimate way.

Mr. John Hare brought over to this country a play which had made an enormous hit in London, Pinero's "The Gay Lord Quex." It has one act — the third, of course, — which is startling in the rapidity and dexterity with which surprise follows surprise, until the wholly unexpected climax takes your breath away. For the sake of this act the play was written. It is only a duel of wits between a man and a woman. But it is admirably written and excellently acted. Mr. Hare as Lord Quex, the polished, aristocratic roué, who holds his emotions in constant check, and Miss Irene Vanbrugh, as the well-meaning vulgarian whose affected calmness is gradually overmastered by hysteria, presented an effective contrast.

There were several minor events which merit at least passing mention. Among these were the charming performance of Miss Annie Russell in "A Royal Family"; Miss Ethel Barrymore's delightful appearance in Clyde Fitch's "Captain Jinks of the Horse Marines"; Miss Amelia Bingham's production of Mr. Fitch's "The Climbers"; the one matinée performance by Mrs. Le Moyne, Miss Eleanor Robson, and Mr. Otis Skinner, of Browning's "In a Balcony"; the representation of Mr. Augustus Thomas's comedy of Western life, "Arizona"; and Miss Margaret Anglin's evolution from a delightful comédienne to an emotional actress of much power. This last was accomplished in "Mrs. Dane's Defence," at the Empire Theatre. Another capital actress, Miss Hilda Spong, who so admirably headed Mr. Daniel Frohman's excellent company at Daly's Theatre in "Lady Huntworth's Experiment," will, next season, become a star. She is a gifted and sparkling comédienne.

Surely, it is worthy of note that the most successful American playwright of the present day, Mr. Clyde Fitch, had no less than five plays running in New York at one time this season. They were, besides the

two previously named, "Barbara Frietchie"; "Lovers' Lane," a picturesque rural comedy; and "Beau Brummel." This does not look as if American authors were discriminated against. Managers are simply looking for good plays — American or foreign. It is an American author, however, who this season seems to have borne off the palm of royalties.

Mr. Ripley D. Hitchcock, the discerning gentleman who, as literary adviser to the Appletons, was happily responsible for the publication of "David Harum," joined with his brother in making a fairly effective drama out of the novel itself and some vague reminiscences of "The Old Homestead" and other bucolic favorites of the stage. The dramatists were fortunate in disposing of their work to Mr. William H. Crane. Of all present-day actors, Mr. Crane seems to be the one best fitted to portray the peculiar type of rural Americanism. He embodies to the eye the gnarled, crabbed, and uncouth surface, while suggesting to the inner sense the underlying humor and humanity. He harmonized these contrasts into a sketch rough-hewn on the same outlines as those whereon David Harum's creator had worked. Nevertheless, he missed, as, indeed, his authors constrained him to miss, some of the charm of the whimsical detail.

In other words, the Harum of Hitchcock and Crane, though amusing and interesting, was not quite the Harum conceived by the novelist and reconceived by the reader. That is a fault to be found in most of the recent dramatizations from novels. Hence, the dramatized novel, for which there was such a rush among managers, and which was to be the play of the future, has fallen rather flat. The trouble lies not with the novel or with the general idea of dramatizing fiction; it lies with the rush. Eagerness to put fiction on the stage before public interest in the book begins to wane is doubtless responsible for much trash which only the popularity of an actor or actress has managed to keep on the boards for the season. Scissors and paste will never take the place of brains — not even of another person's.

Yet one of the best plays of the season is dramatized from a novel. But in this case it was not a current success in fiction which had to be rushed on to the stage, for fear that another book would come up and supplant it in popular interest. It was a novel that had been popular for years; and the play made from it appears to have been as carefully composed as if it were a piece of original dramatic work. I refer to Mr. Paul Potter's stage version of Ouida's "Under Two Flags," which was produced at the Garden Theatre, with Miss Blanche Bates as Cigarette, a rôle she acted with the emotional contrasts inspired by fierce, untutored

love, emphasized by flashes of unreasoning jealousy. In fact, Cigarette stepped out of the novel on to the stage.

That play was not hastily thrown together, hodgepodge, with little of the original, save its title, and practically nothing of its atmosphere. The leading character was made as vivid, as contradictory, and as adorable as in the book. When I add that the production was put on by that master of stagecraft, Mr. David Belasco, it will be understood that this was not the work of a dramatist who had been stumbling over all the others in his haste to get ahead of them in placing a popular book before the footlights.

Mr. Edward E. Rose's method of turning books of the moment into plays — also of the moment — is, perhaps, typical of this American industry. Mr. Rose has dramatized so many books that he can turn a fat novel into a play in two or three weeks. He never reads a book more than once. But after that one reading what a sight that book is! Making the play as he reads, he marks up the pages, cuts out paragraphs, and rips out whole chapters. When he gets through, there is not much left of the novel, but the play is there. For how long it is there is another question. A play so made can hardly be more than ephemeral. Often, too, it must work injustice to the author of the book. He, however, deserves no sympathy. He knows that his book is to be shovelled on to the stage in order that the play may be borne along on the same tide of popularity. He has sold his birthright for a possible mess of theatrical pottage. He is *particeps criminis* — more reprehensible, in fact, than Mr. Rose's pencil, scissors, and paste-pot.

In fine, dramas made from books are of little value when hurriedly prepared to meet a popular craze. Mrs. Fiske has a valuable play in "Becky Sharp," and Mr. William Gillette in "Sherlock Holmes"; but these were carefully studied out and written. The dramatization of "In the Palace of the King," for Miss Viola Allen, and so finely acted by her, was also done without undue haste. In fact, Mr. Marion Crawford, the author of the novel, shaped his plot in consultation with Miss Allen, before he began writing his book. By this reversal of the usual order of things, a first-rate play was secured and no harm done to the novel. On the other hand, such plays as "Richard Carvel," "Janice Meredith," and "When Knighthood Was in Flower" would not be tolerated as plays but for the books and for the fine acting of Mr. John Drew, Miss Mary Mannering, and Miss Julia Marlowe.

How not to dramatize a novel was one of the pregnant lessons of the season. I hope it will be taken to heart.

GUSTAV KOBBE.

A NEW CLASS OF LABOR IN THE SOUTH.

PROHIBITORY statutes directed against the labor of children in cotton factories are simultaneously pending in the legislatures of Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama, while bills of kindred purport are being pressed forward by members of the North Carolina and Mississippi Assemblies. In more than one of these States there will be no such legislation for several years; but it is fairly assured that before the twentieth century shall have completed its first decade no child under twelve years of age will be working anywhere in Southern cotton mills, nor, indeed, any boy under fourteen nor girl under sixteen, except with limitations as to hours and seasons. Compulsory education is also pressing close after such laws, which, even if they should many times fail to pass, will nevertheless before long find a path to the statute book.

Not the most ardent Southerner denies that our section has lagged far behind the East in many movements of profound import to race progress; but in regard to these child-labor laws, no one need be surprised that we are to-day going over ground covered by the lawgivers of New England half a century ago, and that public sentiment among us is only just now allying itself with practical considerations to promote the necessary legislation along this line. The fair-minded will reflect that the need for this legislation came to us late. Nineteen years ago there were only 667,000 spindles at work in all the cotton States; to-day the manufacturing records concede us 7,000,000 spindles in actual operation and another 1,500,000 planned for. The looms have more than kept pace with the spindles. All this means that the textile operatives of the South have grown, since the early '80's, from the most inconsiderable class in their section to a great and rapidly increasing army.

Whence comes this great aggregate of workers that has grown in a score of years from a scant 20,000, all told, to a quarter of a million beings, representing four times that number depending upon the fruits of their labors — a host that swells in size daily as this wide-reaching industry opens up more and more in various directions where natural fitness points the way?

The operatives in the new Southern factories, which means nine-tenths of the factories in the South, are all white, and they have come from the tenant farm, the cotton field, the hill-side corn patch, and the mountain hut. A strictly agricultural or pastoral people by the practice and traditions of many generations, they have been suddenly converted into a manufacturing population. Native to our soil as truly as were their grandsires before them, unmodified by any foreign element, or even by a single urban or communistic instinct, with the rustic vices of America strong upon them as the rustic virtues of America, and knowing nothing of community life, here they are, untrained and untutored, alien to their present occupation, yet strenuously adapting themselves to its demands, and laboriously acquiring the skill requisite to success in their new pursuit. For the present they are still a rural people in traits and tendencies. They have not been strengthened by resisting the evil of cities, or weakened by yielding to it. When another decade has passed, no one must expect the same thing to be true. There will be a better status or there will be a worse,—never the same. Every portent points to the former; for the dullest man can read the signs of an awakening to the rights of these people; their right to better wages, to better homes, to full educational and religious privileges.

But what brought about this movement into the factories? Every one must remember the predictions of Northern and English manufacturers of forty, thirty, and twenty years ago. To give a sample of their arguments, I quote from an address delivered in Connecticut in 1872:

“The attempt to establish cotton manufacturing in the cotton-growing States must continue to be a failure; for, aside from other inherent and invincible defects, the South has no mechanic class, scarcely a laboring class, indeed, save the agricultural, and its tillers of the soil are not convertible into textile operatives. The one solution would be to import mill hands, and other phases of the situation steadily oppose this.”

The speaker’s assumption, that labor which is by ancestral instinct and personal predilection agricultural is the most difficult in the world to be diverted, was in the main correct. But there were unknown quantities conspiring to bring unexpected results before another generation was gone. If the markets of the world had not been manipulated until cotton was forced from its throne, the present situation would have been impossible. The clew to the anomaly is in commercial mutations.

The staple commanded \$1 per pound when the Civil War closed,—a tremendously inflated value, certainly. When it sank to its apparent normal, 15 cents, the vast plantations of ante-bellum days were being rapidly parcelled out into little farms, remaining, in general, the property

of one landlord; but the small plats were rented separately to the landless whites, to the native "cracker" element, and sometimes to the decayed gentry. The rent was always payable in a portion of the crops, cotton being usually required. This system of labor was called tenant farming; and, source of sore evils though it was, it yet seemed the only thing at the moment to take the place of the old labor system which was shattered. The freed blacks soon began to swell the ranks of the tenant farmers; and, the land being once more tilled, the number of millions of bales of cotton increased each year.

Soon the play of traffic, combined with Southern stubbornness and ignorance regarding the diversification of crops, became a serious menace to the cotton-producing States; and it was the tenant farmer who faced starvation first. Cotton had fallen to 8 cents, 7 cents, 6 cents; and the negro, stout of arm and revelling in the hottest sun, was crowding the farmer in the field. But in most cases the white worker doggedly held on, while his faithful but hopeless wife plodded the furrow beside him. The brood of little ones, barefoot the year round, stunted from lack of nourishment, did their share of labor also.

But when the once precious product had been forced down to 4½ cents per pound, is it surprising that much of it was left ungathered in the field, that the tenant farmer was breaking ranks, that an industrial revolution almost without precedent was inaugurated? The small propertied class of this section had been learning its lesson. The sum of it was: We are ruined unless we can manufacture our own staple, and give the world the finished fabric at prices that will enable us, and those that come after us, to live.

Cotton factories were springing up like magic everywhere; and the managers were inviting the poor from all the countryside to come in and follow the new occupation at wages that seemed wealth to them, unable to make the crudest estimate of what the new expenses and needs would be. Young men and women without ties came first; then came widows and orphans in numbers; the tenant farmer himself held back no longer, for the driving behind him was hard enough to conquer the most radical ancestral traits and tendencies. Next came, though in far smaller numbers, the hill-country people, the highlanders, first peeping into the new homes of their one-time lowland neighbors, who, it was rumored, were now enjoying a fabulous prosperity. To look was often to be tempted. The sovereign freedom of the hill-tops was a dear price to pay for material comforts; but more than once even this price has been paid.

Thus have the Southern mills filled up; and the managers of more than two-score of them have assured me personally, in the last twelve months, of their own satisfaction with this class of labor. There are traits born of their past, a few philosophizing mill men have told me, that make these people "difficult." Independence often beyond all reason; a reserve that withdraws even necessary confidences; and an inability to be coerced into measures, however good — these belong to them by the law of inheritance. Extravagance is theirs by the law of reaction. Unacquainted with money in the past, they regard their present earnings by contrast as well-nigh inexhaustible; and these are dissipated in the most improvident fashion. Fair weavers earn from \$7 to \$9 per week, fair spinners from \$4 to \$6.

When we bear in mind that large families are the rule among these people — a single family may have as many as eight workers in it, divided about equally between the spindles and the looms — we recognize that a household which, under the old conditions of the tenant farm or the hill pastures and patches, would have thought itself wonderfully fortunate to handle \$100 in cash per annum, may now bring home more than \$150 every month. The rent of its cottage is from \$4 to \$6 per month; fuel is not an important item in this climate; dairy and garden products and grain stuffs are cheap. Where does the bulk of these earnings go? Several such families which I visited were no more extravagant than other people might well have been under similar circumstances. Give their sense of proportion, of comparative values, a chance to grow, and see if they do not every year find better and better use for their hard-earned dollars! In spite of these and kindred traits, the mill managers find this class of labor really excellent in the main. A hard past has made brave workers of them when they are at work.

But these newly made operatives themselves, are they as well content as the mill owners? Productive industry should have its word no less than capital.

Having gone in and out familiarly for two years among these people, I find the varying strata among them that one must look for even when humanity draws into classes. I find content and discontent here as elsewhere, and each sometimes with, sometimes without, justification. Mills vary, mill managements vary, and the toilers themselves vary most widely. Many of the latter are thoroughly satisfied with what their next-door neighbors may feel to be a mere mess of pottage for which they have bartered their birthright. A few are setting their teeth grimly and hiding their dollars, preparatory to going back to the farms — God speed them!

Yet there is a better class than either — a class with vision that clears every day. Men and women are in it, young and old, some of whom have been in the mills a dozen years or more, some barely long enough to get accustomed to the whirl of the spindles and the throb of the looms. I have talked with boys and graybeards of this class, with little lasses and grandmothers, and they tell me the homely truths which, though they may have been found merely by accident, are yet proving safe guide-posts. "Our village is the best I've been in," said a widow to me at the Erwin Mills, North Carolina. "I hated to change so many times before, but I had to; I couldn't abear fur my gals to grow up in bad company. Now I hain't goin' to move no more, fur the young folks here is modest an' quiet, an' we've got ez good schools ez is in the land, an' the best Sunday-school an' church you ever could find. Mr. Erwin is superintendent of our Sunday-school his own self."

"I wouldn't go nowhar else now," said a young wife to me at the Caraleigh Mills, North Carolina, herself a former operative, now a new mother. "I b'lieve in lettin' well enough alone. There's good wages here, an' good cottages furnished to us, an' Mr. Moring treats us right. Besides, the men work here, an' keep their wives out of the mill when there's little uns to be looked after an' a house to be kep' neat. I want to raise my chillun here an' send 'em to school."

"Fur the chillun's sake!" Here is the keynote to whatever is best in the situation. It links the lowest to the highest.

They are an illiterate people, these operatives. Only 82.8 per cent of the adult workers in the factories of North Carolina can read and write, and the showing is much worse in Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi. How could it be otherwise when they had no schools, or only the "three-months'" county schools, in the past? Now a free school with an annual term of from five to ten months is within the reach of all. Religious privileges have been equally extended. They have bartered the independence of the soil, these workers in the new Southern industry. But if the example of Pelzer and Piedmont, of the Courtenay, Erwin, Tryon, Dallas, Eagle, and Phenix Mills is followed, if the workers are given everywhere, as at these, not merely schools, but the best of graded schools, with night and kindergarten classes; not only churches, but good free lectures and entertainments, as well as public libraries, reading- and club-rooms, technical instruction, and moral and domestic training; a great good to many millions of creatures will be the issue of this unprecedented industrial revolution.

LEONORA BECK ELLIS.

SHEEP AND THE FORESTS.

IN THE FORUM for February, 1901, there appeared an article by Mr. C. S. Newhall on "Sheep and the Forest Reserves," in which sheep are condemned, on several accounts, as an unmitigated nuisance when grazing in forest land. The article in question contains a brief statement of the main arguments which are used in opposing the proposition to allow sheep grazing in forests. The observations of Mr. Newhall were made chiefly in California, and his arguments and conclusions are presumed to be especially applicable to conditions in that State. It has long been apparent to the writer that many of the arguments which are used against sheep grazing do not hold true for all of the forest reserves in different parts of the country, but are, as a rule, applicable to special or local conditions only. I therefore take this occasion of replying to the four principal charges which are brought by Mr. Newhall against sheep, and I shall base my remarks largely on observations made in Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

Mr. Newhall arraigns sheep on the ground that they eat and tread the country bare. It is conceded that sheep are not so omnivorous as goats; but it is claimed that they eat all kinds of shrubs and young trees, even including branches of pines, and that the young shrubs which might, if left to themselves, grow up to replace the old trees are totally destroyed by browsing or trampling. The blame for such destruction is laid to the sheep and to the indifference of herders.

For a number of years the writer was engaged in the study of plants poisonous to stock, and he had occasion to observe the feeding-habits of sheep under all conditions. The majority of these observations were made in Montana, including open-range country, ordinary forests not belonging to the reservations, and the Lewis and Clarke Forest Reservation. It may be stated as a general proposition that sheep seldom, if ever, graze in the timber or even under shrubs in any of the forest land of Montana. The writer has repeatedly observed that where sheep are grazing in open parks in woodland, they will not voluntarily enter the timber, even during the customary noonday rest, but prefer to lie down

in the open, exposed to the sun. The difficulties of managing sheep in timber are very great, since a band may easily become separated and many of the sheep lost. Most of the sheep raisers with whom the writer has had conversation on this subject have said that they issue orders to their herders not to allow the sheep to graze in timber areas, on account of their liability to be lost.

In the Lewis and Clarke Forest Reservation the only timber trees on ground accessible to sheep are fir, spruce, pine, and quaking-asp. Any one who has ever seen a band of sheep feeding in mountains will readily understand the almost insuperable difficulties of managing them in rough ground where the whole band cannot be kept in sight; and this explains, in a large degree, the fact that, strictly speaking, sheep are not grazed in timber in Montana.

It is well known that sheep raisers have the habit of driving their bands of sheep after shearing-time to mountain ranges, where they are kept until snowfall. The forests of such ranges are not continuous, but are interrupted by open parks in which there are no trees or shrubs. These parks are usually well covered with grass and other plants which are eaten by sheep. Extended observation shows that under such conditions sheep prefer the various native plants which are usually grouped together by sheep herders under the term "weeds," leaving the tall grass, especially that which is grown in the shade of trees, to be eaten by cattle. The difficulty of raising cattle and sheep on the same range, usually experienced in an acute degree in open range, disappears under the conditions of mountain ranges.

The writer took occasion to ask all the stock raisers he met for their opinion of the forage conditions of the range as compared with those of ten, fifteen, or twenty years ago, and, without exception, he received replies which indicated that the conditions were nowhere worse, and in many instances were distinctly better, than during the days when stock raising was a new industry. The grass does not now grow so tall as it did then, but it stands much thicker on the ground, forms a better sod, and offers far more nutritious forage than when a few long coarse stems were growing instead of the fine matted grass of the present day.

As to Mr. Newhall's contention that the grass is destroyed by the trampling of the sheep's sharp hoof, it may be well to relate a few personal observations made on this point. Near Gray Cliff, Montana, there is a timothy meadow which has been in continuous sod for about twelve years, and upon which a large band of sheep is allowed to run every year in the spring, *i. e.*, during the time when the ground is moist and most cut

up by the trampling. The timothy has maintained itself in good condition, and has not needed a reseeding, such as would have been necessary if the ground had been left without this breaking up. It is not at all difficult to see that the sod of ranges which lie near sheep corrals, sod which is frequently overrun by large bands of sheep, is denser and yields a greater amount of forage than sod in its natural condition on the range. The statement of Mr. Newhall that nothing is left alive on the ground when a band of sheep has passed must be characterized as highly exaggerated. Sheep do not kill native grass by trampling or by eating it. On the contrary, they exert a decided influence in promoting the development of a more closely growing sod. As to the alleged destruction of small brush by sheep, this is certainly not true for Montana, since, as already stated, sheep do not feed in such situations, and therefore cannot trample over small shrubs.

The second charge of Mr. Newhall is that loose ground is dug up by the trampling of sheep and made more susceptible to the eroding action of water, and that by the same action clayey soil is more firmly packed and rendered more impervious to water. The writer has never seen any phenomena of this sort, and it is exceedingly difficult to understand how the trampling of sheep should have such different effects upon the soil under different conditions. As to clay soil in a dry condition, the passing of a band of sheep has no perceptible effect in packing it or digging it up. When, on the contrary, such soil is wet, the hoofs of the sheep sink into it, and thereby cause a retention of the water, which is exactly what seems to be desired. On mountain sides which bear a sufficient quantity of forage to tempt sheep, the ground cannot be stirred up to a sufficient extent by the trampling to cause any noticeable increase in the rapidity of erosion. As already stated, the observations upon which these statements are based are especially true of Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

With regard to the charge that sheep are indirectly responsible for forest fires, it is only just to call attention to the fact that one evident means by which fire can sweep through large areas of forest is removed by the eating and trampling down of coarse herbaceous growth, and the consequent formation of a sod with short grass in the open park areas which are found throughout forest regions. It would seem to be in accordance with the accepted notions of fire prevention in forests that the maintenance of such open parks in a condition which offers the minimum of inflammable material should be encouraged in every way. The writer can testify from personal observation in many localities that sheep do

this more effectively than other animals, and that they encroach to the least possible extent upon the neighboring forest areas.

It is, of course, necessary that young trees should be allowed to grow to replace old trees which are dying or being cut; and it is interesting to note and easy to see, by a study of the forest conditions of Montana, that the natural areas of forest growth are not those upon which sheep graze, and that the maintenance of such areas does not in any way limit the extent of sheep grazing. So far as the writer has been able to observe, no sheep raiser in Montana is disposed to complain of any limits to his sheep range set by natural forest areas. As to the charge of Mr. Newhall that sheep raisers and sheep herders deliberately set fire to forest areas for the purpose of burning off trees and allowing the grass to grow, it should be stated that as far as my own observations go this does not apply to Montana.

Mr. Newhall says: "Sheep men are careless with their signal fires; they are careless with their camp fires; they build fires carelessly for protection against wild animals; they start fires purposely in the fall to clear the ground for a better spring growth of feed." The camp outfit of the sheep herder in mountain ranges in Montana includes almost without exception a small sheet-iron stove, and it is a rare occurrence for camp fires to be built under any circumstances. It should also be mentioned that sheep men are much concerned with the prevention of fires in forest areas; since sheep are the most helpless of all creatures in case of fire, and are therefore most apt to be destroyed. In the opinion of the writer, the vast majority of forest fires is due to the carelessness of tourists, hunters, and campers.

While Mr. Newhall concedes that tourists and hunters are exceedingly careless in the matter of camp fires, he nevertheless claims that they may be much more easily watched and controlled than sheep herders. To the writer the exact opposite of this statement appears to be true. It is certainly an easy matter for a forest patrol to locate a herder with a large band of sheep. The movements of the band are necessarily slow, and the trail can easily be followed. Hunters and tourists, however, frequently travel with a small outfit, and usually go in places inaccessible to sheep or in localities where sheep would not be taken. They frequently have no well-planned route, but simply take a course which the exigencies of the country demand. It is a notorious fact that such parties almost invariably build large camp fires around which they may spend their evenings; and the writer has frequently found such old camp fires still smouldering after the party has broken camp.

The further charge is made against sheep that the mountain water supplies are polluted by their presence. While this charge is undoubtedly true, it is equally true of all the domestic animals, and of business enterprises which may be established along the lines of streams. It is, of course, impossible to keep all pollution out of streams without prohibiting all business along their course; and the economic question arises, in this connection, as to whether it is desirable to prohibit the development of an immense industry, such as sheep raising, on the ground that the mountain streams may thereby be somewhat polluted. In the case of almost every city in mountainous countries, it is possible to find abundant water supply in the large springs which take their origin from the mountain sides; and water can be piped from such sources without possibility of pollution. If the water supply is taken from large streams, the necessity of filtration or of other treatment of the water becomes apparent immediately; since the water is necessarily exposed to a thousand sources of pollution which are not connected with the sheep industry.

It is, perhaps, not too much to claim that sheep raising is a legitimate business, which is followed by many men of good education who have the general interests of the country at heart as much as any of their neighbors. The business of sheep raising requires that the owner should build an extensive and costly plant and that it should become a fixture of the locality. It is, therefore, necessary, from a business standpoint, for him to conduct himself in a manner which is consistent with the welfare of his fellow citizens. His business depends as directly and as absolutely as that of any other man upon the maintenance of the water supply and of the forage. The average sheep raiser of Montana and Wyoming understands these conditions thoroughly, and manages his sheep on principles which are calculated to maintain a range in good condition and to improve the conditions wherever this is possible. It seems, therefore, to be a decided injustice to the intelligence of the sheep raisers to accuse them of deliberately attempting to destroy the very conditions upon which their business rests.

In the arguments here presented no attack is intended on the general proposition to reserve the forest areas as far as possible. It is contended, however, that the sheep industry is in itself of sufficient importance to demand recognition. It would be unfortunate if legislation should be adopted which would prevent the further development of sheep raising, or even its maintenance upon the present basis, in a State like Montana, where no evidence has been presented to show that the sheep raisers have abused their privileges, or that the sheep have actually done

any damage upon the forest reservation. In the case of the Lewis and Clarke Reservation there are large areas upon which no trees grow from which lumber could be made. Small, irregular trees suitable only for firewood, growing in comparatively inaccessible places which show no evidence of ever having been forested with good timber trees, can scarcely be considered of more importance to the country at large or to the immediate vicinity than the sheep industry of the particular locality. It is believed that this statement would hold true even if the sheep should actually eat up all the trees on such areas. As already indicated, no injury to these forest areas has been thus far found which could be attributed to sheep grazing. The maintenance of a slow and gradual flow of water from the mountains depends fully as much upon the presence of a good sod containing an abundance of grass roots as upon the presence of trees. It is a fact which can be verified even by the casual observer that some of the steepest mountain slopes are well covered with grass, although unprotected by tree growth.

It is frequently stated that the mountain snow is protected from the direct rays of the sun by evergreen trees, and that it is, therefore, not melted as rapidly as in places not so protected. This statement, however, does not hold true for special conditions. In Montana all snow which falls under trees has usually disappeared by the first of June, and from that time on, during the season when water for irrigation is most needed, the supply comes from snow banks which are formed by the continued driving of snow over rocky cliffs and crags in places where there are no trees to impede the progress of the wind. If the mountain slopes were covered continuously with a thick forest growth, the snow could not be drifted, but would lie uniformly distributed to a depth of from three to five feet, depending upon the location of the mountain range. Under these conditions, all the snow would melt off with great rapidity during the warm weather of May and June, and little water would be left for irrigation. The main source of supply for water during July and August is found, as already indicated, in the snow banks which form at the foot of cliffs to a depth of 75 to 300 or 400 feet. The formation of such deep masses of snow would be impossible in a forest.

It has been charged that weeds and other less desirable plants take the place of the native forage plants when the native plants, including grasses, are grazed upon continuously by sheep. So far, however, as the writer's observations go in Montana, the exact reverse of this is true; and it may be stated as a general proposition for that State that the continued grazing by sheep brings about the gradual extermination of

all weeds except a few which are not regularly eaten by those animals. In fact, this matter has long been recognized by a number of the more prominent sheep men; and several of these have informed me that according to their experience the only plants which had become or could become weeds on the range were those which the sheep would not eat. It is well known that native and introduced grasses endure continued close cropping far better than other plants; and, as a result, the grasses come to occupy the ground as the other plants are gradually exterminated by the sheep. In some localities the writer observed two aggressive plants which were gradually spreading; and, as far as they had extended, they occupied the ground almost completely. These plants were a native species of plantain and chickweed, which were undesirable as forage, and were never eaten by sheep.

It may be found desirable to limit the number of sheep which are allowed to graze in the forest reservations; and from conversation on this subject with a number of sheep raisers the writer has concluded that the majority of these men would be glad to coöperate with the Government in maintaining the forest reservations in their present condition, in preventing fires, in protecting timber in other ways, and in preventing any evil effects of overgrazing. As already indicated, fires in the mountains where sheep are being grazed are of more menace to sheep men than to any other private individuals. The sheep may be caught in the fire and burned, or they may be left without forage by the burning of the dry grasses and weeds. The prevention of fires is, therefore, of immediate interest to the sheep owners. These men desire to graze their sheep in the mountains from year to year, and are therefore anxious to preserve the forage plants in as good condition as possible. So far as observations were made by the writer, no deterioration could be seen in any mountain range where sheep were grazed.

EARLEY VERNON WILCOX.

HOW LONDON WAS SAVED.

AMERICANS who work for a nobler city government regard the London County Council as a pattern of ability, integrity, and enterprise that can only be vainly longed for on this side of the Atlantic; but, for their encouragement, they should recall the fact that not many years ago the government of London was the worst in Great Britain — unrepresentative, backward, dishonest, — a subject of scorn and scoffing, a by-word amongst provincial rulers.

Up to 1889 London had no central, representative governing authority. From 1855, the Metropolitan Board of Works, composed of delegates from the local district authorities, conducted such general government as existed. Since the district authorities were generally incompetent, vulgar, and narrow-minded, the Board of Works consisted of a distillation of mediocrity and vulgarity. Originally it was intended to look after main drainage and a few minor matters; but it soon took over the Fire Brigade and bridges, executed large public improvements, acquired and maintained parks and open spaces — became, in fact, even diseased as it was, the only central organ of London's civic life. It was long the despair of progressive citizens. Its incompetence was manifest and its honesty suspected; but years of agitation and hard work were needed to undermine it. At last a Parliamentary inquiry showed that several officers of the Board had been guilty of corruption and that some of the members were not above suspicion.

Opportunely, the House of Commons was constructing a scheme for the rural government of the English counties. In 1834, when the other city governments were democratized and reconstructed, London was left out, because its old authorities were too strong to be overcome; but now, after waiting fifty years, with English disregard for logic, London was lumped in with the rural districts and got representative central government.

The chief fault of the discarded Board of Works was its undemocratic character. Not being elected directly by the tax-payers, it was out of touch with popular sentiment. Its members were unknown mediocrities,

and its decisions were seldom discussed by the public. Therefore the suffrage for the election of the County Council was made wider than for any other London government body. Democracy was courted, not dreaded; by extension, not by restriction, of the suffrage was improvement sought.

What has been the result? Little interest was taken in the first election; only a few zealous reformers saw that this was the time for a big effort to lift London out of the mud. Reactionary interests that had bat-tened on the old system of misgovernment were careless. They thought the city could never be wrested from their clutches; but, to the surprised delight of honest people, the Progressives won a substantial majority. Then came the ordeal. "How will these radicals use their power?" everybody asked.

First, they fulfilled their pledges of non-partisanship by selecting men of the highest character and experience, men of all parties in national politics, to take the seats in the Council that were in the gift of the elected members. They took over the employees of the old Board and made such changes gradually as efficient government required; the politi-cal influence and services of applicants being absolutely unknown. Only two or three times in twelve years have charges of improper influence in appointment been made against a member, and not one of these has been proved.

Most of the members are business men, or professional men in active practice, who take from their private affairs, at some financial loss, the afternoons and evenings which they give gratis to the city. A few labor representatives who receive wages from trade unions and from voluntary subscriptions have done specially good service by voicing the wishes of the manual workers. There is also a sprinkling of titled persons, with a few imperial ex-administrators of special ability and public spirit; but the policy of the Council is framed and directed by the altruistic level-headed business and professional men. As a rule, the work has been too onerous for the titled leisure class. Dry committee detail day by day, with no exciting debates or public show, soon wears out the dilettante representative; but the business man, with habits of work and an ideal of public service, sticks doggedly to the task and moves things forward.

In the first Council, the elements were very diverse and at first uncongenial to each other. It was with many qualms that Lord Rosebery accepted the chairmanship and took the reins to guide this fiery, unruly team. They showed little regard for the traditions of ceremonial and dignity, beloved by most Englishmen; but, what was far better, they

knew the way to win the masses permanently to the side of progressive government.

They began, by heroic measures of self-denial, to show dramatically their severance from the methods of the Board of Works. The favorite form of extravagance with that body was the granting of banquets and liberal allowances for expenses to themselves. The County Council, though its members received not a cent in salaries, decided that they should take no refreshments out of public funds. When committees visit the lunatic asylum twenty miles away, they refuse the hospitality of the institution and pay for their own lunches at the hotel. When the Council meets each week from three to seven, the cup of tea and slice of cake at five o'clock must be paid for by the members. But, most important and effective, they began to use all their powers for social betterment. Having been elected on the promise of progress, they quickened the pace as soon as they were in. Their record up to the present time is astonishing.

The Council took up with considerable enthusiasm the task of providing "gardens for the gardenless." It was quick to recognize that, if the city was to be kept healthy, it would require more "lungs," especially in the crowded districts. It took every opportunity to secure parks for the people. When it came into office in 1889, it had under its control forty-three parks and open spaces, with a total of 2,578 acres. Now it has control of eighty-seven parks, gardens, play-grounds, and open spaces, with an area of 3,814 acres — double the number and fifty per cent larger acreage.

At the cost of much dreary detail work to the unpaid representatives, the open spaces have been made to give the largest return of healthy sport and instruction to the citizens. Special gymnasiums have been constructed for the children; and at Victoria Park huge sand beds have been provided for the enjoyment of the little ones of the poverty-stricken East End. Careful and skilful provision is made for the playing of bowls, cricket, croquet, foot-ball, hockey, hurling, lacrosse, lawn-tennis, quoits, and golf. In the summer time boating and bathing are encouraged; and in the winter months the Council uses every precaution to secure good skating-surfaces on the lakes. It has insisted that a reasonable tariff shall be charged at all the refreshment houses in the parks, and has established a municipal band, which gives 852 performances, at forty-eight different places, during the summer.

The Council won the hatred of dishonest dealers and the regard of the poor, by pouncing down on coal merchants and retail traders who had been

using inaccurate weights and measures with impunity. It secured so many convictions as to make dishonesty impossible, thus saving thousands of dollars to the helpless consumers, the poorest being the chief gainers.

Early in its life the Council began to receive a subsidy from the imperial exchequer, which it was empowered either to spend on technical education or to apply to the reduction of local taxes. Consistently with the remainder of its policy it chose to use it to forward education. Consequently, the facilities for apprentices and journeymen to improve their knowledge of their craft, and their understanding of the scientific or artistic principles that underlie it, are now as good in London as in any city of the world. London possesses eleven great polytechnics similar to the Pratt Institute at Brooklyn and the Drexel Institute at Philadelphia. They are all provided with well-equipped laboratories for the teaching of science and technology in application to the practical requirements of various industries; and they likewise have social and recreative sides, with their clubs and debating societies, their concerts and dances, more or less fully developed. The Council contributes \$250,000 a year to their support, and by expert inspection and advice ensures the best curriculum for the 45,000 students. In addition to these, the Council has established, or aided in establishing, half a dozen special trade schools and technical institutes, opened a central School of Arts and Crafts, assisted numerous technical art schools, improved the science teaching throughout the metropolis, and established a system of scholarships with free tuition and maintenance grants enabling the son of the poorest workman to climb from the public school to the university or technical college.

In no department has the Council's determination to help the working people been more conspicuous than in its housing policy. As the sanitary authority it found numerous foul rookeries in London unfit for habitation, — breeding-places of disease and crime, pest spots on the heart of the empire. The Board of Works, which it had supplanted, had cleared some areas at an enormous cost, and had sold the land to builders, at cheap rates, for the erection of alleged model dwellings that had become, in some instances, "model slums." The Council determined that the only way to guarantee sound structures and reasonable rents was to build houses itself, to supplement the supply by the genuine model housing companies. The obstacles were appalling, but they have been surmounted. Dwellings have been, or are being, erected for 32,000 persons, and the purchase of land has been sanctioned for 50,000 more. These municipal dwellings give better accommodations than can be got for the same rent elsewhere in the locality. They go beyond the requirements of the strin-

gent building-laws which the Council secured after a hard struggle, and they set the standard for future regulations. Besides, they are profitable to the tax-payers; for, after allowing interest on cost and a sinking-fund, which will make land and houses on city property free and clear in sixty years, they yield a small net profit which goes into the municipal purse.

In February of this year, the Council announced its grandest scheme for municipal housing, the largest ever contemplated by any city, which includes the purchase of 225 acres of land just outside London on the north, and the creation of a veritable Garden City, to accommodate 42,500 persons, in beautiful cottages. In the middle of this model city, a city without a slum or a private landlord, a site will be preserved for shops and public buildings — including a free library already promised by Mr. Passmore Edwards — and, near by, a gently undulating open space, with the river meandering through it, will be laid out as a public park. With the Council's street railways extended to the estate, and with workmen's trains on the adjacent steam railways at four cents for the round trip to the centre of London, ten miles away, it is certain that the scheme will relieve the overcrowding which is one of London's most perplexing social problems.

Quite early the Council proved its sympathies and aims by inserting in its contracts clauses requiring the observance of trade-union conditions as to wages and hours of labor. Contractors who had made princely fortunes out of the old Board resented this intervention and formed a ring to bring the Council to its knees; but they found their master at last. The Council proved that the public is stronger than a band of plunderers, if its representatives are determined. As the contractors agreed together to raise their bids extravagantly, the Council resolved to punish them by doing its work without their aid. The Works Department, which resulted, has been the special target of the reactionary minority in the Council, but it has survived all attacks and has been endorsed by strong majorities at the elections. It is almost impossible to decide whether the work done by the Department would have been executed for less money by contractors. The opponents of the system declare that it is a trifle dearer; supporters say that the quality of work and absence of contractors' extras more than counterbalance the estimated loss, while the establishment of the Department has pulled down contractors' prices from fifteen to twenty-five per cent, during the last seven years. One thing is clear; London has appreciated its Council's purposes and has approved its fight with the contractors.

Through the neglect of Parliament to establish a central government for London, all its paying public services — water, gas, heat, railway, telephones, etc. — were in private hands when the County Council was created. No part of its policy has been more determined or won more popular support than its treatment of these franchises. Its members have acted consistently on the rule that they are the attorneys for the public, bound in honesty to discover weak points in the armor of the corporations, and to defend every claim the public has against them — to bargain with all shrewdness and patience for the best terms obtainable. The corporations are abundantly able to look after themselves; they need and deserve no help from the people's representatives.

The County Council has missed no chance to apply this rule. It has spurred the water companies by analyses of the water, by opposing their applications to Parliament for extensions of their systems, and by pushing schemes for buying them out. Inquiry after inquiry has been held with this purpose; plan after plan has been formulated; and offer after offer has been rejected. So far, the House of Lords has refused to sanction terms that the Council considers reasonable, and the matter is still in dispute. The companies, with their friends in Parliament, are determined to extort ten per cent above the market price as compensation for compulsory purchase. The Council will not allow the justice of any such claim. Meanwhile, however, the service has been compulsorily improved; the systems of the different companies have been connected; and the likelihood of water famines has been diminished. The Council guided the municipal agitation against the telephone monopoly, which resulted in a Parliamentary inquiry that overthrew the monopoly and secured the adoption of municipal telephones in some provincial cities, and a government system in connection with the Post Office in London.

With respect to street railways, the Council was able to go further. By the terms of the original franchise, it purchased, as the central authority of London, the lines of the companies at the end of twenty-one years, without payment for franchise value. When the time came for giving the statutory notice, the Moderates (minority) used every crafty device to prevent the purchase; but the Progressives (majority) persisted and succeeded.

In 1896 the Council came into possession of practically all the lines north of the Thames. But the parties being of about equal strength in the Council at that time, it was agreed, as a compromise, to lease the lines to the old company until 1910, at \$225,000 per annum and 12½ per cent of the gross increase of receipts.

In 1899 it acquired in addition almost all the lines south of the Thames, upon terms fixed by an arbitrator, and itself began to operate them. On these lines the Council has instituted a ten-hour day for employees and one day's rest in seven, besides raising wages, providing uniforms free, and lowering fares. Last year, forty-four per cent of the passengers paid one cent; forty-three per cent paid two cents; eight per cent, three cents; four per cent, four cents; and one per cent, six cents.

The reduction of fares represented a gain of \$97,500 to the consumers. Yet the profits were \$485,000, or \$10,000 more than the company earned in the last year of its working. After paying the interest and sinking-fund charges, which will wipe out the whole capital account in twenty-five years on part of the line, and in sixty years on the remainder, there was a disposable balance of \$274,000. Under the leasing system north of the Thames, the tax-payers got \$3,750 per mile; and under the system of municipal operation south of the Thames they got \$7,835 per mile.

The companies had neglected to adopt electric traction in place of the cruel and inefficient horse system; but the Council is making the change, after careful investigations. When it is completed, the profits will almost certainly be increased by two million to two and a half million dollars per annum. Colonel Rotton, when this report was presented, confessed in debate that he and many more Moderates had been converted to the desirability of city ownership.

Lastly, the Council has formulated a scheme for the public control of the London docks, which has been received with warm approval by ship-owners, merchants, and voters; and, further, it is at present developing a city steamboat service to displace the antiquated, slow, and expensive system of a private company, which is again breaking down.

This sketch of the Council's work is enough to show that efficiency for social betterment — the use of the collective power to help especially the weak — has been characteristic of its policy. It has recognized the unity of interest which makes the welfare of the poorest a matter of importance to the richest. It has been daring, ingenious, hard-working, all for one purpose, to make the city a little better place for the masses to live in — to abate their misery a trifle, to increase somewhat their means of enjoyment.

This policy has notably created and fostered civic pride. Public dissatisfaction was as marked in 1889 in London as it is to-day in New York; but the Council has changed grumbling to gladness. The London citizen is no longer ashamed of his city; he sneers no more at his gov-

ernment, nor does he regard an alderman as necessarily a glutton and a boodler. With gratitude he has continuously supported the Progressive policy.

On imperial questions London is always overwhelmingly Conservative. Nearly all its representatives sit on the Tory side in the House of Commons. On the County Council the bulk of the Progressives are Liberals and Radicals, while practically all the Moderates are Conservatives. But the first two elections, and the attitude of the Progressives at the Council meetings, showed conclusively that they thought nothing of national politics when deciding London questions. Therefore, to their banners have flocked thousands of independent voters and altruistic Conservatives who prefer a well-governed capital to empty party victory.

At each election the Moderates have tried to import national issues and to use the national-party machinery, because they knew that the normal Conservative majority was overwhelming. Not once have they succeeded. Against them the Progressives set the list of their social achievements and the programme for more work of social betterment. The supreme test of the voters' fidelity came at the election in March of this year. Only four months earlier the Liberal party had been almost annihilated at the polls in London; "khaki" had triumphed east and west and south and north. Therefore the Moderates, weary and chilled with twelve years of opposition, tried to shed their old name, sad with so many memories of defeat, and came out plumply as Conservatives in an appeal to the voters not to return a pro-Boer Council. As Mr. McKinnon Wood, the leader of the Progressives, retorted on them, the Moderates "held their patriotism so little precious that they took it into the market-place and bartered it for votes."

Further, to mystify the electors, the Conservatives gave a belated endorsement, in their official manifesto, to the social programme which they had been opposing for twelve years, but to which they now announced their tardy conversion. Did the citizens want street railways? The Conservatives were in favor of the rapid extension of the people's service, which they were rejoiced to find so successful. Were more municipal houses desired? The Conservatives would build them wherever they were required. Technical schools, improved parks, good conditions of labor, and the rest—all might be left to the Conservatives.

Progressives easily showed that this old-age repentance, complimentary and gratifying as it was to them, was somewhat suspicious. They would be glad, indeed, if their old foes would help them in future to brighten the lives of the London workers and to fight the monopolistic

corporations. But should not a period of performance in opposition be exacted as a pledge of sincerity? And were not the people who had initiated and partly completed a policy more likely to continue it heartily than the old-time opponents who approved unwillingly? This view was taken by the voters, who, despite the war fever and the obliging promises of the Conservatives, gave so conclusive a victory to the Progressives as will insure rapid and daring advance toward municipal socialism within the next three years. Corruption, incompetence, and parochialism are killed.

Would not such a policy, pursued by similar men with the same sincerity, be as successful in New York and other American cities as it has been in London? In Detroit and Toledo, for instance, have not American voters shown that they are just as ready as Londoners to break the national-party bond in favor of a radical policy of social improvement? Tammany wins the workingmen's votes because it voices, though hypocritically, their hostility to monopolies, their interest in social measures. Reformers lose, partly through their class prejudice, partly through their failure to formulate great measures, their opportunity of leading the people in their attack on overgreedy franchise holders.

A good illustration of the difference between the reform parties in the two metropolitan cities is at hand. In New York there has existed for ten years a Rapid-Transit commission, consisting of eminent citizens, all known as reformers. This commission, now a permanent body, was considered so trustworthy that for several sessions it could get from the Legislature, for the asking, any powers it wanted. Yet, after the citizens had cast a large majority, on a referendum vote, in favor of municipal construction, this commission, on account of difficulties with Tammany, in faint-hearted weariness, presented a bill to the Legislature to enable them to give away the whole franchise to a private corporation. Through their lack of spirit and enterprise, they had already prevented a vote being taken on the municipal working as well as the building of the tunnel, and only by popular clamor was the fatal cession of the whole work prevented. London reformers would have seized such a brilliant chance to lead the electors against Tammany and the hostile corporations alike. They would have said: "We are endowed with large powers; we can obtain more powers if we need them; we are even paid for our services. Why should we not, as public servants, make and work this tunnel for the citizens? Tammany shows hostility; the corporations refuse to make adequate bids; city money is to be used for construction anyway; we can make sub-contracts for sections of the tunnel as easily and as efficiently

as a corporation ; we will keep the entire work and the profit of it for the city itself, and so defeat Tammany and the monopolists together at one blow."

London's experience and New York's insistence on construction by city credit show that such a plan would have won enthusiastic support ; and these reformers, business men of high standing and unimpeachable integrity, could have commanded the city.

To appeal for honesty and decency in government is not enough. Reform politics are not aided by men who do not care to extend city functions for the sake of bettering social conditions ; men who distrust the working classes, and cling with senile strength to the worn-out doctrine of *laissez faire*. Hope for permanent progress lies in the conversion of these men to more liberal ideas, and in the dominance among reformers of the philanthropic citizens with positive schemes of social betterment, who will sacrifice time and class interests for the improvement of city life.

JOHN MARTIN.

THE SPOILED PARENT.

As the extreme practice of almost any virtue may grow into vice, a protest against the abuse of the virtue of filial self-sacrifice may not come amiss. Indeed, when we remember how much has been written of the vice of filial ingratitude, a glance at the exaggeration of the converse virtue seems eminently needful. The literatures of at least three languages contain masterpieces upon the theme "how sharper than a serpent's tooth it is to have a thankless child." Besides Shakspere's "Lear" there is Tourgeneff's "Lear of the Steppe" and Balzac's "Père Goriot." And it is to be noted that with the great Frenchman the vitality of the theme inspired perhaps the truest flesh-and-blood realism in the whole range of his production. Not only the central figure, but all of the characters are strikingly veritable men and women. The book contains none of the more or less shadowy personages thrown upon many of his screens as typical illustrations in the vast scheme of the "Comédie Humaine."

One of the most vivid and pathetic counter-pictures occurs in another story of French life — Mr. Henry James's "The American." Madame de Cintré renounces her marriage with Christopher Newman and buries her heart alive in a convent, at the command of her mother. Madame de Bellegarde, after nibbling at the bait of the American's great fortune, finally concludes that the *mésalliance* is out of the question; and her daughter's inclinations are given about as much weight as those of a horse that wants to turn down one road but is pulled by the bit into another. Madame de Cintré is a martyr to the social system of France, under which there is preserved, in great potency, the tradition of the absolute power of the patriarch of a family in primitive society.

In Roman jurisprudence, the type of the primeval paternal authority, under the designation of *patria potestas*, was preserved in very substantial force down to a surprisingly late era. The exigencies of military and political affairs, however, compelled certain innovations upon the ancient usage:

"In every relation of life in which the collective community might have occasion to avail itself of his wisdom and strength, for all purposes of counsel or of war, the

filius familias, or Son under Power, was as free as his father. . . . But in all the relations created by Private Law, the son lived under a domestic despotism which, considering the severity it retained to the last, and the number of centuries through which it endured, constitutes one of the strangest problems in legal history.”¹

It is true that *patria potestas* as a definite and authoritative rule of law was not adopted by the Germans or Franks. Indeed, Sir Henry Sumner Maine shows that the old French lawyers “were obliged to protect themselves against the intrusion of the *potestas*” by an express maxim. Nevertheless, “all the German immigrants seem to have recognized a corporate union of the family under the *mund*, or authority of a patriarchal chief,” whose “powers are obviously only the relics of a decayed *patria potestas*,” albeit they “fell far short of those enjoyed by the Roman father.”

The prevalence of the *potestas* for so many centuries and the social attitude it made organic in Roman civilization have perpetuated its essential spirit and moral authority among all the various inheritors of that civilization. And thus, as anomalous under the democratic sentiment of to-day as was the rigid preservation of *patria potestas* itself during the Roman empire, the tradition of patriarchal absolutism sways not only quasi-republican France and politically atavistic Germany, but democratic England and still more democratic America. In dramas and novels of American and English life, where instances of filial immolation occur, the moral atmosphere embodies the conventional, undemocratic standard. The point of view is indulgent and apologetic. Parental egotism and exactingness are treated as moral matters of course, although much milder manifestations of selfishness on the part of children would be viewed by the writer and his readers alike as monstrous. A serious social reform to be accomplished by the further evolution of democracy is the setting right, according to justice and common sense — and without subverting real affection and respect — of the sentimental relations of parents and children.

The writer is acquainted with a woman now in middle life whose present appearance would indicate that in youth she had a very fair share of physical attractiveness. She has never married. She is philanthropic in instinct and affectionate in such friendships as she has been able to form. In moments stolen from filial drudgery she has managed to read a considerable amount of good literature, which has been well assimilated. Considering the seclusion in which she has passed the greater part of her days, she manifests a surprising culture and social aplomb.

¹ Maine's “Ancient Law,” chap. v.

She has suffered an eccentric and whimsical mother to absorb almost her every thought and almost her entire physical energy. She has never passed a week away from her mother and probably does not average more than one waking hour of the twenty-four out of her mother's presence. Not only does the mother require physical offices of the daughter in preference to those of a servant or nurse, but she insists upon practically perpetual companionship. There is no reason for the daughter's lot, as the family is wealthy and lives in luxury.

Too many persons who are acquainted with the circumstances are disposed to extenuate even this extreme instance of parental vampirism by ascribing it to an unusually absorbing parental affection. On the contrary, it results from monumental and wicked selfishness. Some measure of personal attachment undoubtedly exists, but it should rank in moral grade about on a par with the tenacity of habit which causes a cat to cleave to a garret. Sentimental ideals should be, and in time doubtless will be, so readjusted that a parent would not dare to go to such lengths of unconscionable self-indulgence, and a child would feel that, though generosity prompted her to yield to every exaction, duty compelled her to refuse, in like manner as it constrains a parent to withhold from children the indulgence that spoils and makes vicious.

The prevailing sentiment was well illustrated by a humorous paper, "On the Training of Parents," by Mr. Frank R. Stockton, which made a decided "hit" on its publication in a magazine a few years ago, and is now included in his collected works. The vein of pleasantry lies in a reversal of the orthodox conception of the relation of tutelage, and in the suggestion of methods by which children may train parents in the way they should go. The following passage, especially, was gleefully quoted by newspapers throughout the country. After describing in detail the method by which a timid horse is coaxingly reconciled with the existence of a wayside, empty barrel, the author says:

"We know well that there are parents who, plodding along as quietly as any son or daughter could desire, will suddenly stop short at the sight of something thoroughly understood, and not at all disapproved of by his offspring, but which to him appears as objectionable and dangerous as the empty barrel to the high-strung horse. Now let not the youngster apply the mental lash, and urge that startled and reluctant parent forward. Better far if it take him figuratively by the bridle, and make him understand that that which appeared to him a vision of mental or physical ruin to a young person, or a frightful obstacle in the way of rational progress, is nothing but a pleasant form of intellectual recreation, which all persons ought to like very much, or to which, at least, they should have no objections. How many such phantasms will arise before a parent, and how necessary is it for a child, if it wish to carry on without disturbance its work of training, to get that parent into the habit of thinking that these things are really nothing but phantasms!"

Why should not the substance, at least, of this admonition be taken seriously? Is it not much more legitimate and just for children tactfully to familiarize their parents with modern customs, of which they may suspect evil merely because they are new — albeit the analogy to the training of horses playfully holds good — than for Madame de Bellegarde to give her daughter's inclinations the same weight as those of a horse that wants to turn down one road but is pulled by the bit into another? The convictions and advice of a child of thirty are apt to be as beneficial to a parent of sixty, who will give heed to them, as the reciprocal influence of the parent upon the child. The ideal family life is that in which the vivid and unprejudiced perceptions of youthful minds are set off against the ripe experience of age. The mutual corrective influence so resulting may be of very substantial mutual help. But many of us are familiar with instances in which the pig-headed narrowness of a parent has not only held back all family development, but compromised or entirely prevented individual careers of usefulness for the children. The social sentiment is in need of revision, so that a child may be encouraged rather than hindered in throwing off the yoke of superstitious veneration.

The most common argument in support of the duty of filial self-effacement is that a child owes a debt of gratitude for nurture and care during infancy that no sacrifice during mature years can repay. This sordid note becomes very familiar to any one venturing to discuss the ethics of the parento-filial relation. A normal parent and a normal child delight in necessary and reasonable sacrifice for one another's good, out of a great affection. Of course, there is underneath their mutual love a sense of reciprocal duty, made up of complex elements on each side. But the "gratitude" argument would ground the filial attitude on what the lawyers term "quasi-contract." Because a parent devoted herself to a child when the latter was young there is an implied contract that the child shall render similar devotion when the parent is old. Not only would emphasis of this view tend to discourage spontaneity of devotion, to set the Gonerals and Regans to studying whether they had not already rendered an adequate consideration for value received, but the contractual analogy is theoretically unsound. Parents protect and rear their helpless offspring in obedience to the strongest and most universal sentiment of natural duty — a sentiment that is no stronger in humanity than in the lower animals. If there be any contractual relation involved, it is the very general one with society that a parent shall care for his children in return for the care he received from his own parents.

As far as the child is concerned, he has a moral as well as a legal right

to be reared from a condition of helplessness to one of self-support by those who took the responsibility of bringing him into the world. And a parent, however sensitive he may be, will recognize, if he be also wise and just, that the manifold relations of society necessarily affect his sentimental relation with his child. As a parent, especially if widowed, grows old, she loves her children absorbedly. Her interest in the world is very largely merged in them. They embody her only hold upon the future. To expect such an absorbing affection and interest in return is to hope against nature. And when a parent, either through a conventional sentiment of filial duty, or by coercion, pecuniary or otherwise, succeeds in monopolizing his child, the latter is likely to suffer arrested development and abnormality of spirit.

The illegitimacy of the "gratitude" argument becomes more obvious when we reflect that it is precisely in cases where the strongest grounds for filial gratitude exist that there is least probability of parental usurpation. Under the surviving tradition of parental ownership, the majority of parents, even in democracies, regard their children altogether too much as personal appendages. Even among well-meaning and ordinarily just persons there is a large modicum of unconscious selfishness in the parental attitude. The average *nouveau riche* launches his children from the very cradle into luxurious dissipation as advertisers of his fortune. A father builds up a fanciful career for a son not yet in trousers, and spends years in a struggle with the tastes of another human being in order to make the latter's life realize a proud and selfish dream. Parental arrogation of the right to control the marriages of children is one of the stock themes of the novelist. A child owes gratitude to a parent in proportion as the latter has resisted self-indulgence and displayed self-sacrifice. And a parent who has subordinated self-interest to the child's real good, during tender and formative years, will be the last person to claim an absorbing lien upon his later life.

In his paper on Edmund Burke, Mr. Augustine Birrell, drawing a comparison between Burke and Cardinal Newman, felicitously lays bare the characteristic attitude of ultra-conservatives in all departments. Burke and Newman, as they regarded humanity, were constantly asking themselves, the former, "How are these men to be saved from anarchy?" the latter, "How are these men to be saved from atheism?" Neither Burke nor Newman

"was prepared to rest content with a scientific frontier, an imaginary line. So much did they dread their enemy, so alive were they to the terrible strength of some of his positions, that they could not agree to dispense with the protection afforded by the huge mountains of prejudice and the ancient rivers of custom."

From a similar point of view, some persons may object to giving expression to the sentiments of this paper, on the theory that it is more important that the spirit of the Fifth Commandment should be conserved than that justice should be done, and that it is necessary to cherish the popular fetish of parenthood, in order that the average man shall continue adequately to honor his father and his mother. I believe this contention to be entirely unsound, and that an instructive analogy may be drawn from the history of the emancipation of wives. Looking at the actual results of educating women liberally and of giving wives independent rights of property, nothing can be more amusing than the prophecies of sentimental wiseacres when the innovations were proposed. It was thought that if women were educated as men were, and thus made intellectually independent of their husbands, romantic love and connubial loyalty would vanish from the world; that unless the law continued to sanction a husband's right to spend his wife's last cent, domestic life and social order and grace would become extinct.

As matter of fact, nowhere in the world is conjugal affection more strong than in the newer Western communities of America, where the spirit of democracy has made most radical progress. In that region not only have connubial property relations been placed on a substantially just basis, but in many of the States great progress has been made toward equal political rights for women. The presence of women as companions of their husbands on public occasions, and the prevailing equality and reciprocal respect between spouses, can hardly have failed to strike even superficial observers of life in the Western States. Connubial love is only the more tenacious and enduring for having a rational basis, instead of resting upon a simpering and plastic amiability.

Reciprocal love and sense of duty between parents and children are deeply implanted by nature in normal human beings. It is, if anything, more purblind than it was as to marital devotion, to claim that an artificial sense of obligation is necessary for their preservation. During the agitation for the abolition of slavery in this country, one of the considerations constantly advanced in extenuation of the "peculiar institution" was that the slaves as a class were well treated and contented and had strong affection for their masters. Post-bellum history teems with illustrations that personal devotion was, if anything, strengthened by manumission. Strong affection is, of course, consistent with a relation of actual slavery, or with what is quite substantially the same thing, marital or parental absolutism. But the tendency of equality and freedom of will is to evolve a deeper feeling, a more genuine mutual love.

In the chapter on "Religious Conformity" in his essay "On Compromise," Mr. John Morley remarks, in treating of the general duty of a man honestly to avow his beliefs and unbeliefs:

"Now, however great the pain inflicted by the avowal of unbelief, it seems to the present writer that one relationship in life, and one only, justifies us in being silent where otherwise it would be right to speak. This relationship is that between child and parents. Those parents are wisest who train their sons and daughters in the utmost liberty both of thought and speech; who do not instil dogmas into them, but inculcate upon them the sovereign importance of correct ways of forming opinions; who, while never dissembling the great fact that if one opinion is true, its contradictory cannot be true also, but must be a lie and partakes of all the evil qualities of a lie, yet always set them the example of listening to unwelcome opinions with patience and candor. Still all parents are not wise. They cannot all endure to hear of any religious opinions except their own. Where it would give them sincere and deep pain to hear a son or daughter avow disbelief in the inspiration of the Bible and so forth, then it seems that the younger person is warranted in refraining from saying that he or she does not accept such and such doctrines. This, of course, only where the son or daughter feels a tender and genuine attachment to the parent. Where the parent has not earned this attachment, has been selfish, indifferent, or cruel, the title to the special kind of forbearance of which we are speaking can hardly exist. In an ordinary way, however, a parent has a claim on us which no other person in the world can have, and a man's self-respect ought scarcely to be injured if he finds himself shrinking from playing the apostle to his own father and mother. . . . Even in the case of parents, and even though our new creed is but rudimentary, there can be no good reason why we should go further in the way of economy than mere silence. Neither they nor any other human being can possibly have a right to expect us, not merely to abstain from the open expression of dissents, but positively to profess unreal and feigned assents. No fear of giving pain, no wish to soothe the alarms of those to whom we owe much, no respect for the natural clinging of the old to the faith which has accompanied them through honorable lives, can warrant us in saying that we believe to be true what we are convinced is false."

This language is significantly valuable, because it repudiates all figments of "divine right," so to speak, which average sentiment has attached to parenthood. Ordinary democratic justice is recognized: if a parent has not deserved generous treatment, the child is under no pious obligation to render it. As to Mr. Morley's immediate point, it is to be remembered that the essay was written many years ago, when the feeling against what was very arrogantly termed "Infidelity" was much more widespread than at present. As the notion of turpitude in a person's inability to make himself believe what he would like to believe becomes extinct, the illustration from religious conformity will lose its force.

But Mr. Morley's spirit and attitude evince sweet reasonableness. If by self-sacrifice in non-essential matters a child can avert a sensitive pang from a beloved parent, duty and inclination will go hand in hand in the act of indulgence. If, however, a parent can be made happy only

by the sacrifice of substantial moral scruples, the child must say "no" with the same firmness that parental duty would enjoin were the request to come from an unreasonable child. And there are moral obligations which a person owes to himself and, through himself, to society. A man has no right to surrender a career of serious and honorable usefulness to the narrowness, prejudice, caprice, or selfishness even of a parent. It is his duty to do his duty as he, not his father, sees it. And even in comparative trivialities, the tendency to parental exaction may be so strong and may develop so rankly under indulgence, that non-submission may be an obvious duty for the good of the parent's own soul.

And here, especially if the parent be approaching senility and be disposed to view the exercise of normal independence by the child as an unnatural outrage, the latter may be subjected to a harrowing experience. Lear's wrath may be overlooked as senile dementia, but Lear's reproaches and tears are abstract pathos. As to this phase, a few words of the Autocrat of the Breakfast Table, spoken not in youth but at fourscore "Over the Tea-Cups," may be taken as authoritative and practically helpful:

"Do you say that old age is unfeeling? It has not vital energy enough to supply the waste of the more exhausting emotions. Old Men's Tears, which furnished the mournful title to Joshua Scottow's Lamentations, do not suggest the deepest grief conceivable. A little breath of wind brings down the raindrops which have gathered on the leaves of the tremulous poplars. A very slight suggestion brings the tears from Marlborough's eyes, but they are soon over, and he is smiling again as an allusion carries him back to the days of Blenheim and Malplaquet. Envy not the old man the tranquillity of his existence, nor yet blame him if it sometimes looks like apathy. Time, the inexorable, does not threaten him with the scythe so often as with the sandbag. He does not cut, but he stuns and stupefies."

It is during the advanced years of parents that flagrant instances of filial immolation most numerously occur. It should be remembered that now the former relation of life has been reversed; the child has become, as it were, the parent, and the parent the child. With the blunting of the intellectual perception, the old man or woman tends to become obtuse to the rights of others in like manner as young children. The habit of unremitting and merciless exaction becomes stronger with every year of submission. The sentiment of society should be such as to fortify every person in doing his rational duty both by himself and his parent; and such duty requires that he act toward one in second childhood with the same tenderness, but with much the same firmness, as toward his actual children.

WILBUR LARREMORE.

THE LATEST STAGE OF LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT.

THE origin, in our country, of the public library movement, which we must not confuse with the free public library movement, is associated with no less a person than Benjamin Franklin, and dates from no less auspicious a year than that which gave birth to the father of his country, the year 1732. During that year the Philadelphia Library Company, "mother of all the subscription libraries of North America," to use the words of the distinguished founder, was organized. Exactly ten years later, little over a century and a half ago, the first legislation that is concerned with the American library took place, resulting in the acts of incorporation of society libraries. The latest library legislation which has national significance bears the date of 1898. Between these two dates, 1742 and 1898, several stages of library legislation, all of the greatest significance, and all playing an important rôle in library history, might be mentioned.

The first legislation following the incorporation of society libraries was the passage in 1835 of laws establishing district-school libraries, the pioneer State being New York. Twenty-one States followed the example of the Empire State, and very great interest was aroused. Still, on the whole, the period representing the stage of library history inaugurated by New York may be considered a failure, though it directly preceded the organization of free public libraries. The next legislation, which occurred in 1849, is the most epochal of our library history. We call it the most epochal, because it gave us the law which through taxation placed libraries on a firm basis. The first State to pass an act to the effect that libraries be maintained like other municipal, county, State, and national institutions was New Hampshire, which State again showed her progressiveness, only a few years ago, by requiring all her towns and cities to establish and maintain public libraries, by taxation. The year 1849, then, is the year which marks the beginning of the free public library. Since then several States, Massachusetts being the first, have passed laws, which provide that towns and cities be encouraged and assisted by the State in the matter of establishing and maintaining libraries.

The fifteen States that have followed in the footsteps of Massachusetts have accomplished excellent results.

In concluding this point, I should like to hazard the prophecy that future historians will regard as one of the most important laws in library history that which was passed by the Ohio Legislature in the spring of 1898. This act, which was made possible by the heirs of the late J. S. Brumback, who set aside a portion of his estate to be used in the erection of a county library, permits county commissioners to bind a county to maintain a library by taxation. The Brumback Library, dedicated and opened to the people of Van Wert County, Ohio, on the first day of the twentieth century, is America's first county library. That other counties of Ohio and the counties of other States will imitate the example of Van Wert County in the establishment of county libraries seems certain from the very great interest that the Brumback Library is awakening in the country.

Fifty years ago, after an existence of 118 years the American library had made comparatively little progress. In the middle of the century just closed there were only some 600 libraries, most of them leading a precarious existence, and with an aggregate total of not many more than 2,000,000 books. The glaring contrast between the early fifties of the last century and the present day is manifest when we mention the fact that America has to-day four libraries which have more books than had all the libraries of the country half a century ago. To-day we can boast of nearly 8,000 libraries, many of which are models of architectural beauty and skill; and the number of volumes contained in these "secular temples" is almost 50,000,000. Besides, we have, at the beginning of this new century, two flourishing library journals, each of them a product of the last fifty years; three well-equipped library schools with courses ranging from one to three years, and already having 500 graduates; two national and many State and district library associations; library commissions in seventeen States; travelling libraries, the outcome of a movement scarcely a decade old, in forty-two States; and travelling pictures. Other innovations, all of comparatively recent origin, are special rooms to accommodate children and the blind, library advertising, coöperation of librarians with teachers of the public schools, access to shelves, coöperative cataloguing, and interlibrary loans and exchanges.

Those who have followed the deliberations of our national, State, and district associations, during the past few years, have noted that the one absorbing problem has been: How can the people, young and old, be best reached and most benefited by our libraries? The problem of

reaching the people of our towns and cities has been in a very great degree solved. The problem of reaching the people in the rural districts, first conceived, and partially solved, by the distinguished librarian Melvil Dewey, in the travelling library movement inaugurated by him a few years ago, has been nearly solved by the late J. S. Brumback, donor of America's first county library. As the Brumback Library is a new institution and represents a new stage of our library development, I shall give a brief description of its *modus operandi*.

The admirable feature of the Brumback Library is the fact that it is a county library, its privileges being extended to the people of the country and of the town and city alike. If we look into the history of the philanthropies of our nation, we shall find that they have almost exclusively benefited the people of the town and city. Who has done anything to make life happier, better, and sweeter on the farm? The reports of our recent decennial census inform us that during the past decade thousands of people have migrated from the country to the town and city. What has been the result? Unhappily it has been that many of the best farm districts to be found anywhere in the country have to-day fewer people than they had ten years ago, although our nation has made, during the past decade, a gain of over ten millions. If we follow our country boys when they leave the farm, we find many of them yielding to the temptations of their new surroundings and ultimately becoming drunkards. If we follow our country girls when they seek homes in the town and city, we find that not a few of them finally reach the brothel. Moreover, how many of the inmates of our insane asylums do statistics show to be from the country! The unattractiveness, monotony, and drudgery of farm life have sent more country boys to the saloon, more country girls to the brothel, and more hard-working fathers and mothers from the farm to the asylum than is generally known. Statistics show that the fate of those leaving the rural districts is often unutterably sad.

It is well enough to talk of the beauties of nature and to fancy that the occupants of the country home, being children of nature, never weary of contemplating her charms. Still, one grows tired at last of an exclusive nature diet. What the farmer wants is a little more art with his nature. He already has, in many places, the telephone, the electric line, and free postal delivery, which bring him into more intimate touch with the rest of the world and render his isolation much more tolerable. However, there are other benefits that can be given him, which the cities and towns of our country enjoy. Why, for example, should not he, like the resident of the town and city, have the advantages of the best litera-

ture of the world? This, so far, has been largely denied to him. When the family on the farm once begins to share in the privileges of the family in the town and city, we shall find that the migration from country to town and city will cease and American life will become far more healthful. It is an incontrovertible fact that the health of our national life is very greatly dependent on that of our rural life. This is just as true as the other statement, more frequently heard, that the prosperity of the nation depends on that of the farmer. If the American people will endeavor, by all possible means, to remove the special elements of discontent which characterize the home of the tiller of the soil, they will do their country a great service.

The method adopted by the Brumback Library to bring its books to all parts of Van Wert County is easily explained. The library itself—which represents a value of \$50,000, receives an annual income of fully \$6,500, and has a stack-room capacity, when all available room shall be used, of 100,000 volumes—is located in the city of Van Wert, the county seat of Van Wert County. Fortunately, this city is located in the centre of the county, which contains in round numbers 275,000 acres and has a population of nearly 35,000. Besides the central library there are ten branch libraries, which are so situated that every resident of the county is within easy access of the library itself or of one of its branches. The ten branches have a unique feature in the form of what may be called a travelling-library system, and are also in direct communication with the central library. The ten branch libraries are placed in the more important stores or offices of the villages of the county, where they are excellently managed, by virtue of the fact that those having charge of them are given nominal salaries.

To start the travelling-library system, the library trustees purchased 1,000 books, most of them entirely new, which were sent to the ten branch libraries, 100 to each branch. After keeping its 100 books two months, each branch sends them to one of the other nine branches, and receives a second 100 from one of its neighbors to take their place. So the books pass from branch to branch until each branch has had the thousand books, when they are returned to the central library, and catalogued. In the meantime, another 1,000 books have been purchased and put in readiness to repeat the experience of the first thousand.

I have already said that the branch libraries are in direct communication with the central library. By this I mean that all persons securing books from the central library through any of the branches are subject to no other rules than those imposed by the central library. Cards can

be had from the central library only; but persons holding cards may secure books anywhere in the county. The more important papers of the county have published lists of all the books contained in the library, and continue to publish the titles of new books as soon as they have been catalogued.

During the few months since the Brumback Library opened its doors to the people of Van Wert County it has been conclusively proved to be a very gratifying success. Unusual interest is manifested, and books go every day to readers in even the most remote townships. It is the purpose of the Brumback Library to accomplish in Van Wert County what some of our more progressive city libraries are already accomplishing in the cities. First and foremost, the interests of the whole county are considered by the trustees and librarians in every move they make. The county's various business, social, and intellectual activities are promoted by selecting the latest and most authoritative works on all subjects, and bringing them to the attention of those who most appreciate them. The tastes and inclinations of every class of people are studied; and as far as these pertain to the province of a library and are deemed practicable they are gratified. As the great university strives to adapt itself to the many who come under its instruction and also to raise them to a higher plane of usefulness, so the Brumback Library strives to adapt itself to the people of Van Wert County, and to raise them to a higher level. If in the years to come the Brumback Library can be credited with having made homes happier through its influences, the purpose of the founder will have been attained.

ERNEST IRVING ANTRIM.

THE NEGRO AND OUR NEW POSSESSIONS.

MANY theories have been proposed for the solution of the Negro problem. It is declared by some that it is a question of the South, as most of the Negroes are found in that section, and that, therefore, it should be settled there, and with reference to the people who will be most largely affected by the Negro's presence; that his education and life should be adapted to his environment; that any education tending to lift him out of his sphere, as it is put — referring, of course, to the higher training — is both harmful and destructive to the interests of both races. These views are based upon the assumption that the Negro is always to remain in the South, and that he is always to occupy a subordinate place — a presumption without an adequate basis of fact.

Colonization is offered as another solution. The black man is advised to migrate westward, to take up unoccupied territory there, to settle down, and to work out his own destiny to the best of his ability. In this way, it is argued, he can best develop the powers within him. Again, it is proposed that the race leave the congested districts of the South — scatter, diffuse itself over the whole country, and, in a sense, lose race identity, by mingling with the whites, as far as possible. And still another theory is more vigorously pressed than any hitherto mentioned. It is declared that this will produce a change operating for the good of all concerned. Its advocates unhesitatingly assert that it is best to confine the Negro largely to industrial lines, to set a limit to his education, to reserve the higher training for a few picked out here and there as capable to receive such instruction, and to make of these leaders; thus encouraging the race, as it is claimed, to maintain its place in the labor ranks.

No matter, however, what theory is proposed by which the many problems concerning the Negro are sought to be solved, and no matter what individuals have accomplished, no one will deny that the race as a whole cannot make substantial progress unless there are outlets for its capabilities and acquisitions. This fact brings up one of the most discouraging features in contemplating the subject — that here, in this coun-

try, it makes no difference what the Negro has done or may do in any line whatever, he finds few opportunities for the exercise of his gifts and powers. He must simply hope on and do the thing he can find to do next him. Hope deferred maketh the heart sick, is a saying proved true in life again and again; and it is only owing to the characteristic good spirits of the race that many of these who are ready for advanced lines of labor can sturdily hold to the thought that there may be a future in which they shall share along these lines. It is this that helps the plucky ones to push on and find niches for themselves here and there, defying dislodgment from a position that brain, and not brawn, has enabled them to fill.

As I have said elsewhere, at different times, the Negro finds everything against him just now. He meets boycott, refusal to work by his side, and closed doors of labor unions. He sees plainly a determined stand to force him back from the vantage-ground he has gained and a resolve to circumscribe him, in every effort he puts forth, and to keep him within his "sphere"; where he may do only those things "of which he is capable from inherited aptitudes," as one puts it, referring to servile or industrial lines. It is a most discouraging state of things that confronts him on every hand. It is assuredly the darkest period in the progress of the race since the Civil War, not excepting the dark days of Reconstruction; for then he had more sympathy from those who looked on and who stood by him. More forbearance was exercised toward him then, and there was a greater desire to forward all his aspirations. In short, his friends were many more than now. To-day he is largely left to himself, to make his way all alone, with the odds greatly against him.

So, with proscription, disfranchisement, prejudice, hate of the lower classes all over the land, Jim Crow cars set apart as his portion without reference to individual status, whether educated or uneducated, refined or vicious, with hotels and places of amusement closed against him, with restrictions in civil and legal rights, and with lynchings on mere suspicion, how can the race look upon the present hour other than as the darkest? Such is the situation, and no one feels it more keenly, experiences more humiliation, or chafes more under the continual ban than does the educated Negro, the man or woman of culture who has fine sensibilities and high aspirations, and who wishes to make of life what he or she has been taught should be made of life — the best possible of every faculty given by the Creator.

A crisis seems to be at hand, and well may it claim the serious attention of friends and of foes — all who are interested in social and eco-

nomic problems. The complications are great, and the race, with this growing enmity against it, is thrown into a dangerous state of unrest. It is a wonder that under the circumstances the balance is kept so true — that the Negro remains the loyal, patriotic citizen that he does. But this true balance is most largely due to the wisdom of the leaders, the good sense of the higher classes, the exercise of judgment and sage counsel by the trained men and women of the race, those who keep faith and constitute the ballast bringing about proper self-control. Thus there is patient waiting to see if light will not come out of darkness, if salvation will not be afforded from what seems a hopeless situation. But while the country at large is thinking as to what it shall do with him, the Negro is feeling that something must be done and done by himself. He is thinking deeply on the situation, and his thought is turning on how he may better race conditions.

As none of the theories advanced looks toward anything else than keeping the Negro in a quasi-peasant stage, or in absolute subjection, or deporting him, they naturally do not find favor with the race at large. Colonization, meaning the isolation of the people as a whole, I firmly believe will be detrimental to any rapid advancement. But I do think that a certain amount of emigration would be advantageous; and in this connection I do not think we have entertained seriously enough the possibility of using our new possessions as an opportunity for the American Negro. It seems to me that this is forced upon the race just now, when the best in it are suffering more or less from the keen humiliation incident upon the stress of the situation and the present pressure that bars advancement everywhere. This consideration seems of vital importance.

I have had occasion to say, at other times, that a curious coincidence is to be found in connection with the three wars in which this country has engaged since 1861. In each case it is to be noted that the consideration of the darker races of the world has formed a prominent feature. While this evidently has its significance relating to the work Providence has given this land as a Christian land to do, in close connection are to be found certain indisputable facts relative to the race resident within its borders.

Despite all that is said about the lack of progress of the Negro along certain lines, it is true that he has had here the opportunities to work out a higher civilization of his own, and he has not failed to grasp them. The higher classes of the race are the results of this opportunity, and they have gathered such strength that there is a peculiar fitness in making

use of their acquisitions among the darker peoples of our newly acquired territory. It may be true that in many ways the future may show, as Mr. Fortune says in the New York "Age," that the more dark peoples that we have under our flag the better it will be for those of us who came out of the forge and fire of American slavery. There will be outlets for the American Negro and a swifter uplifting because of interest for these new peoples.

Advices from Luzon assert unreservedly that there is a great field for the Negro in the Philippines. The reason for such assertion is given by one whose position makes it possible for him to speak with authority. He says:

"Though there are not many Negroes in this part of the world, those that are here are doing exceedingly well. They have no race prejudice to combat from the native, and when compared with white men of equal attainments they possess the vantage-ground over the white brother."

The same authority goes on further to say:

"Again, the white man everywhere seeks to oppress, when possible, the dark races; and differing from the white man in this, the native soon regards his dark Occidental brother in the light of possessing affinity with himself, be he rich or poor. The Filipinos and the Japanese especially — these two hate white people most — receive the colored man with open arms. They would deny him no opportunity — this is not speculation — and are delighted when they see or hear of a great man of color."

Now it seems to me that whether this state of things is pleasing to white people or not, this does signify much in the way of escape from some of the unpleasant situations hedging the race about in this country.

The same correspondent puts it thus:

"If the colored man of the United States will be benefited in any way by the acquisition of territory and new markets by the country, it is manifestly certain it will be in the direction of enlarged opportunities."

He feels certain of these as "evident rich fields presented by the Oriental countries to American colored men of education, push, and energy." In fact, he declares from observation that while this is especially true of the Philippines, it is also true of every country, state, or dependency of the Orient, as Japan, China, Siam, Java, Ceylon. We, here in America, do know that many of these same foreigners try to be contemptuous of the Negro when upon American soil, so that they may not be classed in any way with a despised people. It is a matter of self-preservation, of convenience, to these foreigners; and so when here they follow the fashion of the hoodlum element and attempt to show scorn

whenever they come in contact with a person of color. But at home they do differently.

These facts, as presented to us by one who is where he can judge accurately — on native soil and under un-American conditions — are not the observations of solely one man. There are other shrewd observers in the new possessions, who see the same thing, express the same opinion, and ask the same pertinent questions. Why not lead the Negro in America to see this too? Why not open up the way for him to have a share in doing something for these color kinsfolk?

And why should not the educated Negro, the capable Negro, take part in the movement that has just begun in the Philippines, in Cuba, in Porto Rico, in Hawaii even, for the general good of the governed in these islands? A foreign tongue need be no obstacle. The Negro has a natural aptitude for language. African history will bear me out in this statement, which is corroborated by my own experience with natives from the isles of the sea and from Africa. It does seem, as previously intimated, that the evolutionary process the race has gone through in this country would make such men and women of color of inestimable value in undertaking the evolutions which must take place in the attempt to lead out to the light and on to strength the weaker, dark races of the world, wherever found. The cry comes from the Philippines, from the natives: Why does not the United States send out colored men as school teachers, and in various other official capacities? It would seem wisdom for the government to heed this cry, and to yield to the wish in the effort that is being put forth to bring these peoples under law and government represented by the American flag. The Filipinos especially, we are told, "want Occidentalism, but want it to come through hands of a like complexion to theirs."

Under the present conditions, when the call has come for such a large number of instructors in various capacities, the question forces itself upon public attention: Why not make large choice from among members of the Negro race in America for the purpose? There are plenty of both sexes fitted for this work. With the knowledge of the limited opportunities in this country, it would seem that sincerity of purpose to help solve the race problem would demand that such be given every possible consideration, and most especially when it is known that in these possessions the sought-for "Occidentalism" would be preferable coming through such channels.

It has been frequently stated that the Negro has not the "colonization instinct"; and his failures in Africa to make a way for himself are

brought forward as proof. This is doubtless true. The race has not gone far enough on its road to imbibe this spirit to the extent of making it a success. But a movement looking toward our new territory need not partake of the colonization feature pure and simple, which, as before said, I should not deem advantageous if viewed as isolation. That would be a misfortune. But what is presented as most advantageous is the encouragement to extend the Negro's outlook by personal inducements offered where there is something besides pure savagery and barbarism to contend with.

From Luzon the word comes:

"Some time ago I made an investigation among the Filipinos to determine to what extent their love for the American Negro went, and found that colonization of American blacks among them would be highly acceptable, while white people as ranchers among them could only become established by having a regiment of soldiers stationed at each white ranchman's back."

This sentiment seems to pervade every stratum of life there. And through it may not this very idea of the lack of colonization instinct be rightly gauged by trial under circumstances that must differ from those surrounding the emigrants to Africa? With such a sentiment prevalent, it would seem that here is an outlet that ought to find acceptance in some way among the thoughtful ones of the race, where the Negro's industrial as well as his intellectual training may be utilized with decided benefit to the present generation and may help on marvellously future generations. The German experiment in Africa, of utilizing trained Negroes from America, is one that might fittingly be tried in our new territory, which needs development along the same practical lines to bring it to a higher degree of civilization.

This is not said with any idea that the race must give up all thought of a future as a race right here in the United States; but a movement looking toward these new possessions would simplify the problem in a measure by reducing numbers and showing that the Negro can act for himself. I feel confident that the present dark outlook will give way in time to a brighter one — that the frenzy of hate and passionate prejudice will pass away. If not, the white race will undoubtedly reap a sowing it has little expected. But it is time for the Negro to reach out individually, as some have already done and as many should do, to take courage to face new things, to weigh, then dare (*Wägen, denn wagen*), as the motto goes.

It is not a fanatic rush of all classes into these new fields that will better matters either here or there. These Filipinos are not an unedu-

cated people as a whole. They are not barbarous, uncivilized, poor, as a class. We have plenty of authority to the contrary. Among them, it is said, are some of the ripest scholars the world has. We cannot call them barbarians indiscriminately. The wealth of some is dazzling, and in those Oriental countries there are not a few dark-skinned millionaires. Then, again, we face the fact that these same dark people are in the trade world, first and foremost, competing with the lighter-colored races, showing a sharpness in business matters which in reality makes them marvels of that trade world. So those who would take advantage of this outlook are the men who can do something, manage something, create something.

In the idea existing among these people that the American colored man is a distant relative of theirs — and, above all, that he is not a white man, which for him "is a free passport without credentials," lies the great opportunity for the thrifty, energetic Negro. These same people have no hope, it is asserted, in a white man's country; no more, perhaps, than has the American Negro here, in those sections where the determination to dominate him is tenaciously held. But these isles cannot be said to be the white man's country, because for centuries such has been the mixture that the color line is not known — it is not drawn unless the idea is imported from those countries where prejudice has rank hold.

The color question which Spain, with other countries, was called upon to face long ago led to one thing: despite her treachery, oppression, cruelty, and misrule, she did not humiliate these peoples because of the admixture of blood of darker races. The color question should never be allowed to be injected into that part of the world. There we find places where the dark face may meet with humane treatment, with civility, even with deference, if the manhood back of it deserves it; and there this feeling of equality should be kept in its purity. It may be, as has been said, that it is a good thing for all that more of the dark races are under the American flag. There may be a lesson for all in this fact — a lesson that nothing else will teach — a lesson that man's inhumanity to man cannot forever continue, especially that inhumanity based upon color and assuming a contemptuous, dominant attitude toward it. Can there not be one place on the face of the globe where the white man does not seek complete control; where a channel may be opened up to give the broadest possible opportunity for the strengthening of the weaker races; where black manhood can stand erect and unhindered, and can enlarge respect for itself, or even create it where it does not exist? But to enter hopefully this door, open to the man of color, two things are necessary — aid

and proper treatment from those who have it in their power to help or to hinder.

It would seem that our war with Spain was providential, aside from humanitarian grounds; that the great Ruler of the universe, in permitting this country to gain continuously such signal victories over the Spanish people, intended that, despite its prejudice and race hatred, it should take a leading part in the solution of some of the great problems pertaining to the darker races of mankind. Because of its Christian civilization it assuredly has the vantage-ground for taking a prominent part in this direction. It cannot honorably recede from the initiative it has already taken; and as a sequence it must handle the problems thrust upon it, with the acquisitions of these new millions, in a way that shall command, on the one hand, the respect, or, on the other, the condemnation, of the civilized world. It must deal with these people justly or unjustly. To do the latter is to show itself unequal to the task of coping with the situation; it is to weaken it at home and abroad.

The selection of the Negro for campaigning purposes in this new territory was a wise one. The only thing to be regretted is that more are not thus employed in the foreign military service of the nation. But the hope of the future is that this will be brought about. The black man has proved himself not only a brave soldier, but a patriot as well, in spite of the treatment accorded him. We need only cite as proof of this his readiness at all times to take up arms in his country's defence, and his career at San Juan and El Caney. Campaigning in Cuba, Porto Rico, or the Philippines gives the black man an opportunity to see and study the country for himself, to study its people as he could not under other circumstances. He is doing it, and this very knowledge gained from experience constitutes a new era, the dawn of a brighter day, for the race and its descendants. Though the Negro himself at first looked upon the idea of sending black troops to these new countries as an attempt at expatriation, yet there is hardly one of the race to-day who does not see in this new movement a great amount of good to come to those with whom these soldiers are allied at home. To my personal knowledge not a few of the best of these soldiers propose to stay in the Philippines, and to start out in life there. This of itself will have its influence upon others in America. Gradually the adventurous spirit will develop itself.

In connection with this, it sounds more like a prophecy than anything else, when we recur to the words of that gallant old soldier, Gen. Thomas J. Morgan, who knew well what it was to command Negro

troops, and who did not hesitate to advocate their employment. In the early days of the Spanish war, he said:

"If the United States has really entered upon an era of colonization or of taking under its protection the West Indian and Philippine Islands, we must be prepared for the necessity of a large army of occupation. Such an army could with advantage be made up largely, if not exclusively, of Negro soldiers. They would be better suited for tropical or semi-tropical climates, would be more contented than white men in that far-away service, and would not be objectionable to the native inhabitants of the islands in either ocean, so that there seems to be no special reason why there should not be given to the Negroes at least a fair opportunity to show what soldierly qualities they possess and what fitness they have for official positions."¹

Gen. Morgan has touched vital points. Fair trials only are desired. A chance to determine what the black man can do when out from under the stress of prejudice is necessary to the highest development of the powers within. Let the black man have this chance under conditions which obtain nowhere in this country exactly the same. Let him be encouraged along lines that promise opportunity, and we feel confident that much of this present unrest will be a thing of the past and that his future will be assured as it cannot now be in view of existing conditions in this country.

W. S. SCARBOROUGH.

¹"The Independent," June 30, 1898.

SOME CHINESE TRAITS.

WHILE China is as autocratic as Russia, she is, at the same time, the most democratic country in the world. This may seem a paradox, but, at the worst, the Chinese Government is a patriarchal despotism. In the village the head man rules as a father would rule a family. Lawsuits are abhorred. There are no lawyers, no jury trials. Equity governs the judgments of the courts. I knew of a case in Shanghai in which there was a finding for the plaintiff; but because his conduct had not been perfectly just, the amount assessed in his favor was ordered to be paid to a charitable institution.

If a magistrate fails in his duty, he is set upon by a mob and dragged from his chair, and the insignia of his office are removed, especially his official boots. The gods are treated in like manner. They are put out in the sunshine in times of drought that they may see for themselves the inconvenience of the hot weather, and during rains which last too long they are lashed with whips as a punishment.

High and low are imbued with superstition. No two houses in Peking are set on the same line. One is always farther back or farther forward than its neighbor. The reason for this allocation is that it is believed that the evil spirits cannot turn a corner, and that when they get started they must continue in a straight line, and so go out into space, and be lost. Little clay dogs are placed on all the ridges of the houses, with wide-open mouths, to catch the evil spirits as they approach them. The chief function of the great Almanac, which is published by the Government every year, and controls Chinese action in every particular, is to name the lucky days for doing every act in life — particularly for marriages. A dog is supposed to be eating up the moon at the time of its eclipse; and the population of the Empire turns out, beating gongs and tin pans to drive him away. Several years ago, at Tientsin, a wretched little water snake was caught in the Peiho River, and the populace took it to a temple and worshipped it as the water god. Li Hung Chang attended and worshipped with the others. When asked if he

really believed that the snake was a water god, he said that, whether he did or not, the people did, and it was best to humor them.

After all, in considering the subject of superstition, we must remember that it prevails to some extent in all nations. In our own country people generally prefer to see the new moon over their right shoulder, and to have at the time some silver in their pockets. If the salt is upset, some of it is thrown over the left shoulder to do away with the bad omen. It is bad luck to pass a funeral, and ill-fate also threatens if a black cat crosses your path. The theatre proprietor implicitly believes that if a cross-eyed man enters the house early in the evening there will be no audience that night. We have a large religious society based on faith cure; and in the West ladies of this faith recently wrecked drug stores because they believed that drugs were deleterious.

While I was at Peking several riots occurred on account of missionaries being charged with killing infants, for the purpose of using their eyes to make medicine. This was the actual and only cause of the celebrated riots at Tientsin in 1870, during which thirteen Sisters of Charity were torn to pieces by the mob, and the French Consul, a young Russian, and the wife of the latter were murdered. A few years ago a riot occurred in a town on the Yangtze, because a missionary lady put her hand on the head of a boy in the street. The boy immediately fell down in a pretended fit, claiming that he was bewitched. A riot ensued in which two foreigners were murdered and all the foreign property was destroyed. When the diplomatic body discussed this question with the members of the Tsung Li Yamen, we were astonished to find that some of the members actually avowed that they had believed that the members of dead children were used to make medicine.

The remedy proposed by the Yamen was that the asylums for young children should be abolished. Indeed, that remedy ought to be seriously considered; because no people are more tenacious of ideas once conceived than the Chinese; and a riot may at any time occur if the death of infants ensues soon after their admission to an asylum. In 1896, I believe, a scoundrel, whom the missionaries had offended in a town on the Yangtze, sought revenge by burying the body of a dead child in their compound. He then accused the missionaries of kidnapping and of killing the child; and he led a party to the place where he had buried the body. Immediately a terrible riot arose, during which the missionaries had to flee for their lives, and all their property was destroyed. After things had quieted down, a legal investigation was held, at which it conclusively appeared that the man had himself buried the body in the mis-

sionary compound, for the sake of inciting violence against its occupants. The man was condemned to death, and, singularly enough, the missionaries tried to save his life because he was the brother of a great friend of theirs; but he was executed.

That very many infants do die in the asylums is undoubtedly true; nevertheless, the kindest and most efficient care is taken of them. The object of the nuns in receiving them is primarily to save their souls by administering the rite of baptism. With this idea in view, they receive infants in the last gasp of life. If they survive, they are tenderly nurtured; and when they reach a marriageable age the boys are married to the girls. Of course, families of those who are thus married are devoted Catholics. They have never known any other religion. This is the chief mode of proselytism of the Catholic Church. In 1886 I went through "L'Asile de la Sainte Enfance" at Hongkong. I asked the Lady Superior how many infants were received every year, and she said 1,100. I then inquired how many of them survived, and she said 100. We went into a very clean and nicely furnished room where, in little cribs, were found about a dozen newly received infants who were sucking milk from india-rubber bottles. I said, "Surely you will save all these," and she answered that they would all die. The Protestants generally do not establish infant asylums. I know of but one in the Empire, and that is in charge of the American Episcopal Mission near Shanghai.

It is, of course, very much to be regretted that the traditional antagonism between the Catholics and Protestants should find a field for its exercise in the Far East; but it exists. In a place not far from Swatow there was actual fighting between the adherents of the two religions, and one man was killed. In this particular case it has never been settled which party was to blame for bringing on the fight; but I believe that the Protestants finally raised money to be paid to the relatives of the dead man. Money settles everything in China. When the adherents of the new religion get to fighting, the Chinese are inclined to keep hands off. They are besieged by the representatives of the antagonistic parties, and are afraid to do anything.

A rather curious case happened, during my time, in the Province of Shantung. A number of poor people, who were under the religious control of our missionaries, joined together to build a chapel. A subscription paper was circulated, and one individual subscribed a liberal amount. A lot was bought, and the chapel was built, and after the congregation had worshipped in it for a considerable time, the individual mentioned was

turned out of the church for immorality. As soon as this event happened he turned Catholic. His next step was to declare that the lot on which this chapel stood belonged to him, and he accordingly proceeded to donate it to the Catholics.

The terrible row to which this proceeding gave rise is almost inconceivable. The matter was reported to the French and American Ministers at Peking. The Catholic priest came in person to urge his claim. The American Minister represented to the Yamen that in no civilized land could a man subscribe money to buy a lot, and induce other people to subscribe for the same purpose, and then, after the lot was bought, claim the title to it. The doctrine of estoppel prevails. Still, fear of the French induced the Yamen to refuse to decide the question. It was then demanded that the matter be left to the courts. This was done; and there was a trial, followed by two appeals, but nothing was decided. The Viceroy then sent two Commissioners to the locality to settle the question. They proposed to pay to the original congregation the value of the chapel, and to provide in addition another lot; and these terms were accepted. Thus ended a controversy which threatened to cause civil war.

I presume corruption exists more or less in every government in the world, and among all peoples as well; but in China it is legalized, as it were, by immemorial usage. Be it said to the credit of the Chinese merchant that he is as honest as any of his class anywhere in the world. All the banks and all the Americans who do business with China corroborate this assertion. The manager of the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation asserted at Shanghai a few years ago that the bank had done business of hundreds of millions of pounds sterling with the Chinese, and had never lost a penny. Nevertheless, among the officials and common people a system of what is called "squeezing" largely prevails. Your "boy," your cook — in fact, all the servants — will charge you a percentage on everything they buy; and they will deduct something from the price of everything they sell. There is a system in Peking called "boarding with the cook," in accordance with which you pay so much a day per head for everything except groceries and such articles as are furnished from the store-room. Persons who desire to be economical try this plan, but it comes to exactly the same thing as if you paid the cook's bills yourself.

The members of the Tsung Li Yamen (Foreign Office) receive about 1,000 taels per annum, or 770 of our dollars, as salary. Yet there is not one of them whose income is less than 30,000 taels a year, while the head of the Yamen, Prince Ching — who is now acting as Com-

missioner with Li Hung Chang — receives 250,000 taels. This money is all paid each year in three instalments by the office-holders. Li Hung Chang had a man stationed at Peking who did nothing whatever except pay money to thirty high officials three times a year. The Hoppo (Treasurer) at Canton keeps out of the moneys collected by him 300,000 taels every year. All the world knows that he does it, and nobody thinks it is wrong.

The head eunuch at the palace in 1894 made enormous sums of money by compelling persons who sent presents to the Empress Dowager, on the occasion of her attaining sixty years of age, to pay for the privilege of having them delivered. Sometimes he received as much as 4,000 taels for passing in a single present. A young friend of mine, who had been appointed an expectant official, had to pay 4,000 taels before he could get into the palace, where he was compelled to go to return thanks to the Emperor for his appointment. In my own Legation, when a new building for the offices was erected, the servants forced the contractors to pay them 500 taels.

When ladies buy silks or other goods in the Chinese city they are asked by the merchant whether they intend taking them home in their carts. He says that if he has to send them he must charge ten per cent more than the price, because he will have to pay that sum to the gate-keeper. Every curio man who brings his wares into the Legation pays the servants a fixed percentage on all his sales. Thus a fund is created which at stated intervals is distributed among all the servants according to their rank. When I left Peking I sold off my property, and, among other things, a mule. The Mafu sold the latter for \$50, and brought me \$40. He was not at all abashed when I explained to him that the cut was rather heavy. He said that it was the custom of the country.

It is customary for every distinguished visitor to pay money to the servants of his host. There is paid on these occasions as much as fifteen or twenty taels. When you dine with any one a sum of money is given to you with which to pay *douceurs* to the servants; and when you give the return dinner you are expected to pay a similar sum of money. On one occasion, when I dined at Canton with the Viceroy, he sent me \$25 to be given to my bearers and servants. I found that I should have to pay the same amount when he dined with me; so the two compradors arranged that the money should be returned, and that I should pay nothing on the occasion of the return dinner.

Owing to this system of gifts to servants, wages remain very low. Cumshaws are paid by every guest, and the proceeds of "squeezes" mate-

rially increase the gains of the servants. Were it not for these incidental profits, it would be impossible for them to live. As a rule, they receive only six Mexican dollars (about \$3 of our money) a month, and they find themselves. They all have families, and they raise them very respectably. In the Legation we had men who had been there for thirty years, and their sons as they grew up were also thus employed.

It is curious that the pseudo-progressives, the aerial and sublimated friends of a progress which rests on fancy and wind instead of on real benefaction to humanity, should share the prejudices of the Chinese officials. The Chinese, like some of our orators who talk so glibly about "Commercialism," have never understood why foreign governments are eternally worrying over trade. As a government, China has nothing to do with commerce. That subject is for the merchants, and not for the statesmen, to handle.

I once went to the Tsung Li Yamen to request that a government exhibit be sent to the Chicago Exposition. I showed to the Yamen that their teas, silks, embroideries, old armor, and many other things would be splendidly advertised by being displayed in Chicago. Some stress was laid on the fact that Ceylon tea was driving the Chinese product out of the market, and that strenuous steps should be taken, both to improve the cultivation of tea and to bring it prominently into public notice. The only answer I got was that the Chinese Government had nothing to do with trade: that was for the merchants to attend to. They would allow goods intended for the Exposition to be sent abroad without paying any export duty, and that was all they would do.

All over the East — until Japan recently reformed herself — to be a merchant was a degradation. In China the soldier also has been under the ban. The literati were, and are, the heroes of government and society. When a man had passed the civil service examinations he might be an admiral or a general, though he had never seen a ship or put a squadron into the field. A little knowledge of the writings of Confucius and Mencius made him fit to rule a province or to represent his country abroad. He knew no more of commerce than an unborn babe. He wore finger-nails six inches long, to show that he had nothing to do with business or labor.

According to a certain modern school of orators, we are coming to the Chinese idea that the Government should never do anything that tends to promote or increase the commerce of the country. The function of government is simply to elevate man; but it must not undertake this process by furnishing good dollars, or by opening up new markets for agricultural products or manufactured goods. Indeed, the mere

use of the word "market" is in its effect like shaking a red flag at a bull. Any allusion to "markets" is tabooed. We must turn all our attention to the sublime, but entirely undefined, process of elevating individuals. Unfortunately, we are not told how we can accomplish this feat. As nobody disputes that education should be as free and general as the air, there can be no controversy on this point. As everybody wants to make money, no difference can arise on that question — except that the Government, following the Chinese idea, should do nothing whatever to increase the facilities of the people for bettering their condition.

These same people, however, who so vigorously attack "Commercialism," lie awake at night to try to find out something that the Government should do in the way of interfering with the business, private habits, and customs of the people. A great party wants the Government to buy, own, and operate all the railroads. The forefather of that party wanted the Government to receive all the products of the country in enormous warehouses, and issue interest-bearing bonds to the owners — a system which China tried two thousand years before Christ, and repudiated.

The most prominent motto in the recent political campaign hung from the festoons on Broadway, and read: "The whole trade of the East is not worth the life of one American boy." This declaration was considered peculiarly apposite and touching. Yet, tested by common sense, it is supremely ridiculous. Nobody wants an American boy, or any other boy, to die; but, if an enlisted soldier dies in any hemisphere while in the performance of his duty, he dies for his country. Whether he dies in battle, or is prostrated by fever, he will rank for all time among those of whom it is said that it is sweet and honorable to die for one's country.

We had better disband our army if the doctrine is to prevail that the soldier shall not take the ordinary risks of the service wherever his Government may order him to go. As well might we have said that all our Western country was not worth one soldier's life, and have left it to the Indians. Under these conditions we should have to abolish the railroads, because they kill people every day. We ought never to put down a riot at the risk of taking human life. Let the property in cities be destroyed by the mob — what are commercial properties in comparison with the value of a human life? The mind of the man who does not take some pleasure in the increasing greatness of his country is distorted and unbalanced. Such a man worships a party more than he worships his country.

Is it possible that any respectable number of Americans will account it as either disgraceful or injurious that we have become the greatest exporting country in the world? Is it possible that any man will regret that the Alabama and South Carolina cotton-mills were, until the recent disturbances, running night and day to supply the Chinese markets? Is it "base Commercialism" for our Government to help our countrymen by wise treaties or conventions to undersell the European in his own market; to build locomotives to run over the Siberian road; to send our mining plants from Denver to China; to beat in South America goods "made in Germany"; to double for us the trade of Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines? Is it possible that politics can so warp the intelligence of honorable men that in the great industrial growth of this country they see nothing but evil? The foe of the human race is poverty. It leads to sickness and death and crime.

Arrange that on the last day of the year every man may count his earnings, and find that he has paid his way and saved something for a rainy day! Such a man is happy. The social arts and graces, books, music, independence,—all these will come to him and his family.

Our mechanics are the best in the world. Let the Government do all it legitimately can to give them a world-wide market. No music is sweeter than the hum of countless looms. No symphony is more joyful than that of the innumerable revolving wheels of commerce.

CHARLES DENBY.

BRYANISM AND JEFFERSONIAN DEMOCRACY.

If we are disposed to question Carlyle's lugubrious characterization of the world, and all that therein is, as "a dusty, fuliginous chaos," yet, since the late election, we must concede its application to that part of it constituted by the Democratic party. Nor, as we view the landscape o'er, is the gloomy prospect at all lightened by the proposals of sundry gentlemen, who, since 1896, have been belligerent rebels against the party, to "reorganize" it, forthwith.

The seceders insist, as a basis of reorganization, that the party shall be led back to "the principles of Jefferson"; yet not one has vouchsafed to tell us what is meant by that venerable phrase. To Jefferson and Jackson and the other "fathers," Jeffersonian Democracy meant the assertion of the principle of political equality. Though Jefferson borrowed this new notion from the "sceptics" of France, yet, because he was instrumental in checking the reactionary Toryism of the Federalists and in infusing the spirit of these radical democratic principles into the vast majority of his contemporary citizens of the Republic and into its institutions, after a great contest against the opposite, or aristocratic, principles of Hamilton, this Democracy has been styled Jeffersonian. But Jefferson and the other democratic fathers did not dream of the great question of the practical application of these merely fundamental principles to the economic conditions which have come into existence since their day.

The English people were forcing their way, surely, though not with clear sight, toward representative or parliamentary government, with a subordinate or responsible executive. This principle of popular sovereignty had been recognized, though not firmly established, under William and Anne. George III undertook to go back to the comparative absolutism of the Stuarts. This contest between reactionary Toryism and progressive Democracy was waged alike in England and in the colonies. In the mother country it resulted in the evolution of a government more quickly and surely responsive to the popular will, and with less obstruction to it, probably, than the government of any other country. In the colonies it resulted in Independence, and in a government under a Constiti-

tution which was largely infused with the Toryism of the time of George, and in which the process of evolution has been obstructed by its written form. This circumstance explains the presence to so large a degree of George-the-Third-Hamilton Toryism in our government to-day, without exciting wonder or even consciousness.

The framers of our Constitution did not comprehend that the same struggle which won our independence had also, in effect, won for the English people independence from the hereditary upper house of Parliament and the sovereign or executive — in short, a government directly by the elective House of Commons. Excepting such moral influence as they wield and their expense as a relic preserved by the peculiar conservative spirit of the English people, the monarchical executive and the titled upper house of Parliament have been almost inert since the Reform Bill of 1832. On the other hand, our own Constitution, patterned as much as Hamiltonism could make it so after the English constitution of George — and as liberal and progressive a pattern as the world then afforded — remains to us in its original procrustean letter, and in much of its original Tory spirit.

Jefferson played his momentous game of politics with a cue taken from the great French radicals, whose spirit and principles were even then in a life-and-death grapple with the aristocratic order, which they overthrew, never successfully to rise again. This distinction between two marked political tendencies has come down to the present day through the Democratic party, which was born of Jefferson's struggle, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, through the Federal party and its successors, the Whig and Republican parties. The French Revolution reorganized the whole social system and placed it upon a new basis. The revolution of Jefferson in 1800 established new principles of national polity, and organized and administered the new American political society along new lines and in a new spirit. Jefferson's democracy was abreast of the democracy of the French philosophers who inspired the French Revolution. Hamilton, on the other hand, was behind Pitt and Fox, who inspired the English revolution against the reactionary Toryism of George, but who were conservatives in comparison with the revolutionists of France.

Jefferson believed, and doubtless with good reason, that Hamilton would "convert the people to the doctrine of kings, lords, and commons" — not the sovereign commons and subject kings and lords, as we have known them since 1832, but the sovereign kings and lords which Jefferson and Hamilton knew, and against whom the colonists rebelled. Jefferson wrote to Lafayette that the Federalists "have espoused our new

Constitution, not as a good and sufficient thing in itself, but only as a step to an English Constitution, the only thing good and sufficient in their eyes."

A standard biographer of Jefferson speaks of him in these words:

"His faith in the laxest form of democracy, scarcely removed from anarchy, stood to him in the place of a religion ; he preached it with a fervor, intensity and constancy worthy of Mahomet or Wesley. . . . He was observant and quick-witted, and soon appreciated the skill with which Hamilton was rapidly constructing a powerful, centralized government.

"Jefferson remained steadfast to his adhesion to the cause of the people, *even the worst and lowest people*.

"Not only did he appreciate and foresee their invincible power in politics, but he had perfect faith in the desirability of the exercise of that power ; he anticipated that in this exercise the masses would always show wisdom and discrimination."

Mr. Henry Adams thus expresses the contemporary opinion of Jefferson held by Federalists, and especially by those of the virtually "established" Congregational Church of New England: "Every dissolute intriguer, loose-liver, forger, false-coiner, and prison-bird ; every hair-brained, loud-talking demagogue ; every speculator, scoffer, and atheist, — was a follower of Jefferson, and Jefferson was himself the incarnation of their theories." His European and American critics, Mr. Adams tells us, united in calling him "a visionary whose theories would cause the heavens to fall upon them." He was "an extreme radical."

The reader already perceives that, in citing these strictures upon Jefferson from the pages of Morse and of Adams, we repeat the very epithets and charges that have been hurled against Mr. Bryan and "Bryanism" by our secessionist Democrats, who are now invoking a return to "the principles of Jefferson."

Perhaps the most influential of all Democrats just now has spoken, in his latest book, as Jefferson and Jackson spoke when they were organizing and establishing the Democratic party : "And will not to-morrow's evolution, the advent of truth and justice, be brought about by the constant onslaught of the greatest number, the revolutionary fruitfulness of the toilers and the poor ?" It is significant that Zola has lately been scourged by the military and "regular-order" sentiment of his country, and that he wrote these words in exile because he had offended it. In passing, it seems pertinent for us of the seceders to remind ourselves that even our own Cleveland, confronted by the same terrific forces of monopoly which have drawn out Mr. Bryan's "revolutionary" and "socialistic" assaults, was up and at them with Bryanic vigor and in language not outdone by Mr. Bryan's "incendiary" speech.

Cast in a glittering generality, "economical government and strict construction of the Constitution" are the spirit of Jeffersonian Democracy to which the reorganizers would return. But these two principles have never before breathed with the fervor with which they have breathed out of Mr. Bryan's mouth. In the late campaign, the idealistic justice of a strict construction of the Constitution in its application to the Philippine question was made paramount by Bryanism, to its distinct disadvantage.

Is it the income-tax feature of Bryanism which must be cut off in order to restore the original Jeffersonian countenance of the Democratic party? Even Cleveland's administration, with his own advice and consent, enacted an income-tax law; and if I should go so far as to hint in passing that the Supreme Court thwarted public sentiment in a questionable way when it annulled that law, I should be but following the example both of Jefferson and of Jackson, who indulged in the severest criticism of that Hamiltonian obstacle to representative government, in its modern development, whenever, in their judgment, it deserved censure. If this reminder falls short of sanctifying taxation of incomes to the seceders, then they should reflect that it has been a regular feature of English policy, sustained by Tory and Liberal alike, ever since 1842.

But the complaint urged by Bryanism against the Supreme Court for its alleged tendency to abuse the use of the writ of injunction is also a grievance of the Jeffersonian reorganizers. Well? Jefferson affected to believe that a federalistic Supreme Court was threatening the liberties of the people and the integrity of the Republic, just as Bryanism affects to believe the same thing of a Republican federal judiciary; and Jefferson thereupon said of the court: "These remains of federalism are to be preserved and fed from the treasury, and from that battery all the works of Republicanism are to be beaten down." In 1822, shortly before his death, he said further:

"Before the venom has reached so much of the body politic as to get beyond control, a remedy should be applied. Let the future appointment of judges be four or six years, and removable by the Senate."

Jefferson being found at the head of a class of scoffers at our judicial holy of holies, mayhap we seceding conservatives may take refuge behind our other titular saint while we point the finger of shame at sacrilegious Bryanism. But, alas! Jackson, too, is convicted by history of a like lese-majesty; and his offence is the more flagrant as his temper is more intense.

Or would we return to Jeffersonian Democracy from the proposal of Bryanism to elect Senators by popular vote? The present indirect

method of election, like many other Hamiltonian checks and obstacles to the Democratic expression of the popular will, would, in its present pernicious application, be most hateful to Jefferson. Besides, the present House of Representatives, so strongly dominated by Republicanism, to which we conservative seceders have of late often fled as a protection against Bryanism, has resolved in favor of the popular election of Senators by a vote of 240 against 15.

I observe that certain prominent gold-standard Democrats, who are also at the head of national banks, demand a return from Bryanism to Jeffersonian Democracy. What can this mean? For Jefferson was a virulent opponent of a national-bank system, which was the creature of his hated federalistic rival, Hamilton; and Jackson inherited Jefferson's hatred. When he became President, he fought the system to a complete finish, opposing it with arguments that Bryanism has appropriated for the same purpose.

What Jefferson or Jackson would have done about the silver question, if they had been put in Mr. Bryan's place, is a matter of inconsequential conjecture. What Mr. Carlisle and many other former Democrats who now propose to reorganize the Democratic party did when confronted with the silver question, in the same circumstances as those in which Mr. Bryan was confronted by it, is a matter of fact. In 1878 Mr. Carlisle, catering to an ignorant constituency, ably assisted in passing a sixteen-to-one free-coinage bill in the House of Representatives, and then in passing it again in the modified form of the Bland bill. Mr. Carlisle's eloquent sophistries in support of these measures have served as golden texts — will the reader pardon the incongruity? — ever since. But the fatal fault of Bryanism lies in this: It not only ignored the palpable fact that the fault of its silver programme was precisely the same in kind as that of Carlisle and other Jeffersonian Democrats of 1878, but also that its impracticability had in the meantime become apparent to the public; in short, that it was already a "dead horse."

In reality, he who runs may read more of the spirit of Jeffersonian Democracy in the Chicago and Kansas City platforms than can be found in any other platform of the Democratic party. Furthermore, in his political beginnings, when he knew or had read little else, Mr. Bryan crammed himself with lessons from Jefferson's life and was an ostentatious disciple of that eminent radical. Indeed, it is precisely this quality of Jeffersonism in Mr. Bryan and his platforms which is offensive to the conservative or old-school Democracy. It was left to Bryanism to illustrate the fact, which the Bourbon Democracy does not even yet compre-

hend, that Jeffersonian Democracy is quite out of joint with the times. If Jefferson should come back now to the country whose political institutions and polity he so largely shaped and inspired, he would meet the same sort of a reception as, in Mr. Stead's opinion, would be given in Chicago to his great forerunner as a social leveller.

Both Jefferson and Jackson lived in very primitive social conditions compared to those in which Mr. Bryan is undertaking to apply their political and social notions. They could, with confidence, appeal to the "plain people" then, because there were few of any other class to oppose or control them. They did not take into account the coming supremacy of organized capital, much more potent in its control of the dependent "plain people" than Mr. Bryan's idealistic notions of individual liberty, because they had not dreamed of the revolutionary advent of steam and electricity, or the teeming population which has been their concomitant. Fisher Ames had said, in 1791: "Ages must elapse before the vast wilderness west of the Alleghanies can be peopled, and then God only knows how they can be governed." And Jefferson in his first inaugural address, contemplating only the northwestern territory as far as the Mississippi, said: "There is room enough for our descendants to the hundredth and the thousandth generation." The same sudden creation of modern means of transportation and other mechanical appliances, which so utterly confounded the prophecy of Ames, has thrown out upon the banks of progress the let-alone individualistic policy of Jefferson and Jackson, where it lies obsolete and stale.

Jefferson and Jackson established a system of political equality, and then dreamed that this comprehended economic equality, or, at least, economic freedom. But so great has been the economic and social change since these great political builders wrought that we are, in the words of Zola, "in a democracy ravaged by political equality and economic inequality." The great French radical could not have described more truly or aptly our present condition, if he had had his eye upon us instead of France, or perhaps European society in general, when he spoke these words. Though this condition is the basis of Bryanism and of party cleavage, yet it is so unconsciously; or, at the most, is vaguely perceived. We are in a state of economic anarchy. We pretend to be living in Jeffersonian equality, though we have not adjusted our methods and institutions to changing conditions for a hundred years.

The genuine Jeffersonian Democrat, however, still seeks Jefferson's ends, but, perforce, by methods the very contrary to Jefferson's methods. Jefferson thought he had established equality when he had established

the principle that there should be no political or legal check upon the freedom of individual competition — the natural regulation of society by its individuals. But if Jefferson lived in present economic conditions he would stand for a policy, not of hands off, of *laissez faire*, but of governmental interference and regulation. In short, rejecting some of the mere vagaries of Populism, such as money fiatism — for he was a philosopher — he would be a Populist, if not a Socialist. He would be either for the abolition of the Senate as an obstruction to the modern principle of parliamentary government, through a legislature fresh from the people, or he would be for the election of that body directly by the people.

Instead of Hamilton's scheme of life-tenure executives and senators, and other forms of feudalism designed to save the people from themselves, he would see the cohorts of feudalism in another guise in the saddle — the lords of trusts, the knights of transportation, and great corporations of a thousand kinds, compelling the homage of his plain people. From this point of view he would at once perceive that to insure reasonably free play to that competition and individual effort which was his social ideal, all those institutions and agencies which are natural monopolies, or lead naturally to monopoly, must be put under complete public control, and that government ownership and operation of all such agencies are the logical and inevitable road to the desired end. A logical, present-day Jeffersonian Democracy, while it would remember the aim, the principles, and the precepts of Jefferson, would reverse his practical application of them. This modern Democracy of Jefferson would still be something more than a memory ; it would be the old spirit but in a new body — the same architect with the same ideals, but working with quite new materials and new tools.

The sentiment of a large number of the anti-Bryan Democrats is in reality distinctively anti-Jefferson ; and, moreover, it is really with Republicanism where their votes and influence have been for the last five years. As for Mr. Bryan, he is in a practical sense so distinctly neither one thing nor the other, that Bryanism presents little for a practical party, with any chance for practical success, to stand upon. The whole budget of specifics of Bryanism, such as free silver, the paramountcy of the mere sentimentalism of the Philippine question, hostility to national banks, the faint friendship for greenbacks, the superficial specific for trusts, and the little paragraph about the great railway question, was at the outset devitalized or dormant. The general appeal to the lower masses against the higher classes was especially untimely last year ; and

in general it is unwise, owing to the satisfaction of a vast majority of the most influential people, if not with their condition, then with their chance to better it.

The materialism of the Republican issue was sordid and aggressive beyond precedent, yet it seemed only to inspire the desired confidence. The one notable Republican campaign speech in Mr. Bryan's home town was made by Senator Frye. He sustained the Philippine position of his party almost in these words: "Some of the peace commissioners went to Paris determined to take as little as possible from Spain; I went to get all we could lay hands on." This was part one of his address. Part two was, in substance: "Your bellies were empty when McKinley came in, were they not? Well, they're full now, are they not? What more do you want?" The first sentiment raised a sweeping tornado of applause, whose significance to me was startling; the second was received all but as ardently.

Perhaps the most distinguishing manifestation of the ethics of the great Christian nations of Europe in the last twenty-five years has been their universal robbery of the countries of weak, uncivilized peoples. In the late campaign Republicans seemed surcharged with this spirit of spoliation. They were possessed also by paternalistic prosperity worship: "McKinley is my shepherd, I shall not want. He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters."

The foregoing sketch of existing conditions is intended to serve as a basis for a forecast or conjecture of the near future of the Democratic party. The more conservative sentiment, which, since the lesson of the late campaign, has plainly come to be dominant in the party, has no programme. This will be its strength in 1902 and 1904—if the leaders do not prevent the rank and file from getting together. The Republican programme is simply to take care of business, regardless of any far-sighted principle, moral or otherwise. It takes care of the great and the strong, leaving them to take care of the small and the weak in pretty much their own way. For the present, under the still lingering influence of the panic and the recovery from it, this policy is strong in itself and with the people. But in the natural course of events, a reaction against it will soon be due.

Incident to this strong monopolistic programme of the Republicans is their policy of taking care of their loyal members to the utmost, at the public expense, by the lavish and greedy use of the tremendous resources now afforded by the public patronage. Popular rebellion against this policy might defeat the Republicans in 1902 and 1904, if the opposition

should take up new leaders of "safe" principles and tendencies, who would stand for retrenchment and honest, economical administration; in general, for reform — in short, for the corrective policy which brought magnificent success to Tilden once and to Cleveland twice. But the new leaders must be of later date than the Bourbon Democrat of the Cleveland régime. The Democratic party has moved ahead materially since his day. Tilden and Cleveland won, not because they stood for the restoration of the ancient Democracy, but because they boldly cut loose from it. They stripped the party of its out-of-date habiliments and dressed it in contemporaneous clothes.

The power of Tilden's political personality, platform, and letter of acceptance wrenched the party away from its old obstructive policy, and, more important still, put a summary end to its coquetry with fiat money. Mr. Cleveland, in turn, cauterized the party's silver recrudescence, and raised it to its feet with a tonic of sound-money principles. His personal reputation made a real issue of honest and economical administration and the development of civil-service reform. Thus, in 1876, 1884, and 1892 a great body of the most intelligent, conservative, and independent, yet progressive, voters was won over to the long-distrusted party. If the leaders will but let nature take her course, the same class will do the same thing in 1902 and 1904 as it did under Tilden and Cleveland. Will this happen?

The ultra, or Bourbon, conservative will be easily kept out of the way. Not so with Mr. Bryan. If he permits or is compelled to let the natural conservatism of the party control it, will he not then be impelled by his momentum to lead or propel a large faction of the party to desert it? Is division the fate that Mr. Bryan holds in store for the Democratic party? The unimpeachable purity of his public and private life, his persistent appeal to lofty and Democratic ideals, and the alluring personal charm with which he presents them, will continue to command, and perhaps to deserve, in spite of his faults, a great and devoted personal following. But he is too much the agitator and magnetic advocate to be a successful party leader. His whole career up to the present time foretells that he will continue to struggle for personal supremacy in the party and for the supremacy of the Chicago and Kansas City platforms, *in toto*, — the bad as well as the good, the dead as well as that which is alive in them. If, as seems likely to be the outcome, he falls short of control, what then? Ever since he began his struggle for control of the party, with us, his fellow Democrats of Nebraska, in 1891, he has, with only occasional early reverses, easily won majorities to his side. But those who have known

him from the first will say, I think, that if the majority turns against him he will not rebel but will conform. For even Mr. Bryan's imperious will, audacious aggressiveness, and apparent unyielding radicalism are threaded on traditional Democratic conservatism and respect for the majority.

Mr. Bryan's natural followers since the election will be confined to the ultimate or logical Jeffersonian radicals. To accommodate himself to this following he should consistently, and at once, stand for postal savings banks, public ownership of telegraphs and all means of transportation, and perhaps of all deposits of coal and other staple minerals. This he will not do, because his tendency is to build for the present and not to wait for development or slow party growth. He can win nothing practical on opportunist or temporary issues, because he is too widely distrusted by conservative classes — whether on good grounds or not is not material.

A German writer tells, in a current story, of a Hebrew family that was in need of the indispensable unleavened bread for the approaching feast of Pesach. The improvident husband persisted day after day in spending his slim earnings in unnecessary notions and luxuries, always quieting his wife's remonstrances and fears about the still-wanting bread with the answer, "What must be, must be." He insisted that because he must have the bread for an all-important and sacred purpose it would be forthcoming. In his case his fatalistic faith sustained him. While he squandered the resources by which he might have secured the bread, at the very last the neighbors chipped in the money and bought it for the distressed wife. Mr. Bryan has had a fatalistic confidence that his Democratic ideals would surely be realized because to him they seemed indispensable. But here the parallel to the Hebrew story ends. The unappreciative public refused to chip in the votes which Mr. Bryan's improvidence had failed to secure by practical means; and his followers, who are wedded to him by the close ties of faith and dependence, go hungry.

From the beginning he has sought ostentatiously to win a following of "plain people." This foible I always believed would have a disastrous culmination; and it contributed very largely to the great majorities against him which distinguished the late election. At the very beginning of his career, before men of conservative, ripe judgment in his home community had acknowledged his capacity or stability, the plain people adored him and pronounced him a great man. Old party leaders of his district shrewdly, as they thought, made use of this fact

to win a Democratic member of Congress by nominating Mr. Bryan. This was before the dazzling opportunities of free silver had burst upon him as a heavenly vision. His promoters, of course, expected simply to use him. When he began to provide for reelection, however, he at once used them, and in a characteristic way. The votes of the free-silver Populists, who were becoming numerous in the district, were needed to overcome the large Republican plurality. Mr. Bryan reasoned that the old-timers would vote for him any way, for the sake of tariff reform, then the leading party issue, which they did under protest, while he gathered the plain Populists about his free-silver banner.

In his speeches in that campaign, he would publicly list those Democrats who were against free silver, and who also had any appearance of being financially prosperous or solvent, as "bankers" and emissaries of the "money power." This clever device was successful in a remote rural district; but when the whole country came to be his battlefield, fear of the untrustworthiness of so large a part of his forces enlisted in such a way frightened away countless numbers of those who were natural opponents of the Republican party. Those who naturally became his lieutenants, under this ultra-plain-people programme, were found wanting in capacity and influence when the greater test came. Of course, also, thousands and, perhaps, millions of the plain people whom he had rallied proved unreliable and surrendered to the "belly" argument. This original and persistent characteristic of Mr. Bryan illustrates why he has always been, in fact, the leader of the Populists, without subscribing to their specific principles.

If the rank and file of those who are naturally Democrats were permitted to drift together, they would stand for economy of public expenditure; they would revive the question of tariff reform, with, perhaps, especial relation to its effect upon trusts; they would seek to rescue the Cullom bill from the Senate committee pigeon-hole, where Republicans have kept it for several years, in spite of public sentiment, and with it endeavor to give vitality to the principle of railway control; they would revive the abandoned principle of civil-service reform; and they would treat the Philippine question in a rational manner, which may be best ascertained after the decision of the pending cases relating thereto in the Supreme Court. They would adopt the principle of an income tax. Besides undertaking to remove the main props of the trusts, discriminating tariffs, both customs and railway, they would seek to regulate these combinations of capital so as to prevent their abuses, but in a rational and progressive spirit. They would constitute, in general, an anti-

monopoly party, being in opposition to Republicanism, but not a revolutionary or destructive party. As a progressive measure they should advocate a postal-telegraph system. This would be an introduction to other progressive measures, which it seems to be the destiny of the Democratic party to adopt in due season.

As for the lion that lay in the Democratic line of march in the campaigns of 1896 and 1900, it will doubtless be easy to evade him in 1904. For unless the Republicans do something very unusual or unexpected, such as adopting the measure for making silver dollars redeemable in gold, Democrats may well assume a Napoleonic attitude and say, "There shall be no money question." It is possible that the breath-taking rate at which industrial consolidation is now going on may upset ordinary calculations and seem to call for "fast" leadership; and yet it is hardly likely that political view-points will be much changed in the next three or four years.

Wholesome progressiveness involves party idealism. Bryanism has idealism in good measure, but it smacks too much of the past; Republicanism has none. Both parties should perceive that the gulf widens between our ideals, which are the measure of our intelligence, and our performance, as exhibited in our institutions; that through fear or other incapacity we fail, almost ludicrously, to practise up to our conceptions. Meanwhile, the impatient reformer may acquire patience, and the conservative, who stands always trembling in overweening fear of radicals and radicalism, may achieve equanimity by reflecting that political change in countries of the conservative or English type is, after all, both a slow and a sure process; that though its movement lags, it is yet constant. And both reformer and conservative should be mindful of this bit of philosophy which has lately emanated from a well-known scholar within the conservative precincts of Oxford University:

"It has never been denied that the process of gradual remoulding is a part of living, and all admit that the state (which lives like any other thing) must suffer such a process as a condition of health. . . . There is in every branch of social effort a necessity for constant reform and check; it is the business of a politician continually to apply such correction. . . . What test can be applied by which we may know whether a reform is working toward this rectification or not? None, except the general conviction of a whole generation that this or that survival obstructs the way of right living—the mere instinct of justice expressed in concrete terms on a particular point. To observe it is to keep the state sane, to neglect it is to bring about revolution."

ALBERT WATKINS.

ART AS THE HANDMAID OF LITERATURE.

THE English man of letters who seems now to hold the centre of the stage has complained of a lack of artistic and literary ideals in the American people. "They measure progress," he has said, "by the snarling together of telegraph wires, the heaving up of houses, and the making of money." It is possible that Mr. Kipling is not exempt from those prejudices concerning America which are the heritage of English men of letters, but he is nevertheless the poet-laureate of the Empire "by the grace of God;" and Sir Walter Besant is no doubt correct in saying, that "never in the history of literature has story-teller, in his own lifetime, faced such an audience." Unless, therefore, Americans are content to rest under the imputation of great inferiority in respect to the finer attributes of mind and soul, they should inquire whether there is evidence which could justify so sweeping an assertion.

In making such an inquiry, it would soon be discovered that others than Mr. Kipling, and of their number many Americans, have not hesitated to deplore the inferior position which has long been held by American art. That we have had no national school of art and have produced but few really great men of letters has been freely enough admitted; but to most of us this will doubtless appear to be a natural and, in fact, almost an inevitable consequence of the peculiar conditions under which the Republic has been evolved. The growth of the United States, while an eminently healthy one, has nevertheless been accomplished through a constant struggle, amid dangers which have threatened its very existence. These conditions have produced a powerful organism, fitted to survive in the battle of life. Appreciation of opportunity, quickness of resolve, fertility of resource, magnificent courage, tireless energy, and dogged determination to succeed, have become national characteristics; but there has been small opportunity for development of the imagination, or for a contemplation of those beauties of thought and style, of form and of color, which make up the world of literature and art. The rich development of the finer sensibilities in nations, as in men, comes only after the body has attained to maturity. Geographical and political isolation

are, moreover, responsible for a certain selfishness of spirit and a narrowness of view — a provincialism, in short — but little calculated to produce great results in the realm of art. It may, indeed, be true, as has been more than once expressed, that the "white man's burden" of carrying the Western civilization to the benighted portions of the globe, fraught as it is with so much of sacrifice, of patience under disappointments, and of unrequited toil, may bring with it the possibility of moulding a nation in a nobler form, with greater and broader development of the mental and spiritual life.

There are indications, however, that the American nation is now entering upon a new stage of its development, and that the tendency to look outward, which has been so marked a characteristic of the end of the century, has not been confined solely to commercial and governmental affairs. With a rapidity which is the more remarkable because it is so often unperceived, transformations in many fields of endeavor are bringing about a new discovery of America to the world. A better time seems even to be dawning for American art, when perhaps the best literary painting of the year is Mr. Edwin A. Abbey's "The Trial of Queen Catherine," and when Anders Zorn, the distinguished Swedish painter and etcher, fresh from the Paris Exposition, is reported as saying:

"Without prejudice or national feeling, and simply from the point of view of an art critic, I consider the exhibits of American and Swedish artists at the Paris Exposition the most praiseworthy of all. American art is showing a freshness and a strength due to a vigorous nationality, and it is making most marked progress. In commerce and in industry America has produced a race of giants, and slowly and surely she is producing giants in art as well."

Nor is it alone in painting that American art shows signs of progress. The "White City," whose palaces and temples rose in classic beauty from the shores of Lake Michigan, did not fade away until its image had been reflected in the minds of those who thronged to see it, and who thus for the first time became aware of what American architects could achieve if freed from the usual restraints.

If painting and architecture have acquired in America a new importance, it is nevertheless in a widely different field that American art has made its most remarkable advance. I cannot say how generally it is known that the work of American illustrators is the envy of their European confrères, or that the world's Bohemia of illustration is centred in the city of New York, just as truly as that of painting centres in Paris. The most notable growth of this department of American art has been very largely confined to the last fifteen years, and it has attained its full

flower only during the past decade. In the place of the ten artists who previous to 1885 supplied all the demands of American book illustration, there has appeared an army whose ranks are recruited with such frequency that acquaintance with its personnel is well-nigh impossible.

The late C. S. Reinhart, the late William Hamilton Gibson, and the present leaders, Abbey, Smedley, Cole, Frost, Pyle, Remington, and Vedder, will by future generations be accorded a place among the masters of illustration. In the widely separated fields which they have individually chosen, each is to-day almost without rivals but with many imitators. Newer leaders in the art include such men as Walter Appleton Clark, F. C. Yohn, Howard Chandler Christy, E. C. Peixotto, Henry Hutt, Maxfield Parrish, and Ernest Haskell, all of whom have been before the public for less than three years, and no one of whom is much over thirty years of age. A very large proportion of American illustrators have been trained in academic methods, and have further had the advantage of rich and varied experience in life; but they belong to no school and have no one characteristic so marked as that of individuality.

To explain this exceptional development of illustrative art in America, English writers draw attention to the large sums paid to artists by American publishing houses. For the illustrations of a single number the publishers of one of our standard magazines may expend as much as \$2,500; but this is chiefly significant as showing that the American people demand illustrations of a high order of merit, and are willing to pay for them. That a like enterprise would be welcomed in England may be inferred from the fact that one of the great American illustrated magazines has a larger circulation in England than has any similar English periodical. In France drawings in black and white are held in less esteem, and French illustrators find a market for much of their work in America. It is significant that of the two important works on modern French illustration, one is published by the Scribners. Yet the introduction of continental ideas of art has had much to do with the renaissance of art illustration which began in America in the early eighties. Some one has said: "The secret of the fine arts is illusion on a ground of truth." It was the "ground of truth" that up to that time had been lacking.

The conditions existing both before and after the transformation will be made clear if we recall the experience of a veteran illustrator who was instrumental in ushering in the new era. At the time, the art department of the magazine to whose staff he belonged was located in the printing house; and the artists drew each upon the wooden block,

sitting in little booths partitioned from their neighbors, like the desks in a telegraph office. The illustrator, who did so much to advance his art, merely requested of the house permission to employ models in his work. This simple request was at first met with a refusal, but in a few months, as interest in the project was aroused, permission was granted to hire an uptown studio and employ as many models as desired. This proved the entering wedge in the existing system; for soon all the other artists followed the example set, and a complete change of method was the result. Instead of evolving a drawing out of the inner consciousness, there was developed a keen faculty of observation, and with it there came a shock of surprise as the crudeness of the earlier work began to be appreciated. Remington, with unusually keen perception, observed correctly the motions of animals before Muybridge's ingenious photographs had astonished the world. Meissonier, the father of French illustration, only less keen in this respect, is reported to have exclaimed in despair when he saw Muybridge's photographs, "Mais maintenant, je suis trop agé," and to have spent a sleepless night thereafter. To one with his exalted idea of truth, the shock must have been severe, for he had been drawing animals incorrectly all his life.

Important and far-reaching as was the introduction of the method of drawing from the model, it was a reform which could hardly have been long delayed, inasmuch as American art students fresh from the masters' studios were beginning to return in numbers from Europe. It is of some interest, however, that the reform occurred so near the time when the progress of invention was to revolutionize the art of book illustration throughout the world, both by enlarging greatly the possibilities of pictorial representation in engravings and by simplifying and cheapening the processes of reproduction.

In both wood and steel engraving and in lithographing processes, the artist drew his design in reverse on the surface of the block; and this drawing was translated by the engraver in his characteristic "handling," in many cases, with mannerisms and conceits peculiarly his own. Not only, therefore, did the medium upon which the drawing was made and the reversing of the picture impose great restraints upon the freedom of the pencil, but the necessity of entrusting the half-finished product of his brain and hand to an often unappreciative engraver so handicapped the artist that he rarely succeeded in bringing out of his drawing what was originally intended. The engraver, having his own reputation to make, often purposely changed the design if it did not quite suit his fancy; and, since it was the engraver's name, and not the artist's, which

became connected with the finished illustration, the artist found little incentive for improving the quality of his work. His only escape from the tyranny of the engraver lay in acquiring the engraver's art himself; and so there came to be developed an important class of artist wood engravers, in which class Americans took the lead.

The introduction of the camera into engraving brought with it new and important changes. The artist could now draw in a free hand, leaving it to the camera to transfer his creation to the block, a task which it faithfully and expeditiously performed. It was, however, the invention of the "process" plate which brought complete emancipation of the artist from his bondage to the engraver. Not only did the new process afford the artist almost absolute freedom in the use of his pencil, but he was no longer bound down to the limitations of line. He could now employ all the subtle illusions of charcoal, crayon, and brush; for the new process interpreted the "values" of his original with at least a moderate degree of success. Of the two modifications of "process"—zinc etchings and half-tones—the zinc etching is able to interpret line drawings only, but it accomplishes this with almost absolute fidelity. The half-tone plate is employed to engrave crayon and "wash" drawings, but its success is largely dependent upon the work which it attempts to interpret. In general, it may be said that half-tones are, in comparison with the originals, flat and characterless, a defect which may, however, be in large part corrected by clever hand work.

It is the cheapness of the "process" methods in comparison with the older forms of engraving, the greater possibilities of enlarging and interpreting correctly the artist's work, and further, his delivery out of the hands of the engraver which have brought about the renaissance of the art of illustration throughout the world, but especially in the United States. Wood engraving as an industry has undoubtedly suffered by the introduction of "process," but as an art it has made as distinct an advance.

The present-day illustrations of the "Century Magazine" are chiefly of four kinds: wood engravings, "process" plates of line drawings, half-tone "process" plates, and "tone engravings," or half-tone plates worked over by artist engravers. These illustrations are made up a long time beforehand, and are put upon the magnificent Hoe presses fully three months in advance of their issue. As regards the future, there is likely to be a place for the colored illustration, now that we are passing, in the phrase of one writer, the "tomato-can period" of the art. Mr. Ruskin has said: "We ought to love color and to think nothing quite beautiful or perfect

without it." Yet it is likely that colored illustrations will only slowly, if at all, take the place of black and white. Excellent work in color by Pyle, Clark, McCarter, Parrish, and Miss Stillwell may, however, occasionally be seen in later issues of our standard magazines.

I have thus far referred to illustrations simply as pictures, having in mind their artistic quality only. Regarded in this light, no better survey of the field could be obtained than by an examination of the pages of "Harper's Magazine," the one hundred volumes of which contain examples of the work of nearly every prominent American illustrator. It is not enough, however, that an illustration should be a work of art. Mr. Tudor Jenks has well defined the fields of the artist and the illustrator:

"An artist is one who makes pictures with the primary purpose of pleasing the eye and the aesthetic tastes that are addressed through the eye. An illustrator is one who makes pictures, also, but with the primary purpose of pleasing the intellectual faculties already addressed by the author's text."

The primary object of illustration is, then, to illuminate the text, and to that end it must never obtrude itself, but must always be supplementary to the work of the author. Art illustration is thus made truly the hand-maid of literature; and the illustrator, to achieve success, should possess both a knowledge and a keen appreciation of literary work. That art illustration has advanced, when measured by this standard, is sufficiently indicated by the increasing liberties which have been granted to American illustrators. Formerly the artist was given a line or set of lines from the text, for which he was to furnish an illustration. To-day he reads the author's manuscript, making his own choice of scenes and situations. It was also formerly the rule, where it is now the exception, to find illustrations which in their spirit, if not in their form, were more or less foreign to the text which they were supposed to illuminate. The word "illustrated" on the title-page of a book has long been connected in the popular mind with that uniform quality of perfection which is so inseparable from the "hand-painted" on Christmas novelties. Important literary works bearing the label "illustrated" have masqueraded before the public, when literature would have been the gainer had the author's word pictures been left undistorted or even uncaricatured by the artist's pencil. This has sometimes been true, I think, even when the artists employed were the best of their time; and it perhaps emphasizes the fact that there are some literary works, which, for their adequate illustration, demand a unique combination of exceptional talents.

The edition of Dickens illustrated by that famous coterie of artists which included Cruikshank, Seymour, "Phiz," Cattermole, Leech, Dar-

ley, Gilbert, Doyle, Tenniel, Landseer, Palmer, Stanfield, and several others, presents perhaps as remarkable an array of pictures as can be found in the works of any novelist. It is, I believe, a somewhat popular impression that these drawings are also in a remarkable degree successful; and Mr. Tudor Jenks has recently compared them most favorably with the best of recent illustrations, emphasizing the fact that they made the characters of the story live upon the page. While it cannot be denied that many of them are truly admirable, there are others which are gross exaggerations or even caricatures, and I cannot believe that they correctly set forth the author's conceptions. It is, in any case, a matter of record that Dickens's illustrations were rarely other than disappointments to him; and, if his biographer is to be believed, the author would have preferred to have had his books left without the artist's pictures. "He was apt," he said, "to build up temples in his mind not always makable with hands."

If the illustrations to Dickens are many of them caricatures, those of Thackeray are hardly less so. Since the latter were the work of the author himself, we must assume that they represent a sincere attempt to set forth the pictures of the text as the author conceived them. Granting that they are suggestive, Thackeray was yet so absolutely devoid of technique that his illustrations, even when worked over by Walker, were nearly always failures. Only a very great artist or a very presumptuous one would attempt to portray Beatrix Esmond as she appeared to Henry at Walcote:

" . . . She was a brown beauty; that is, her eyes, hair and eyebrows and eyelashes were dark; her hair curling with rich undulations and waving over her shoulders; but her complexion was as dazzling white as snow in sunshine; except her cheeks, which were a bright red, and her lips, which were of a still deeper crimson. Her mouth and chin, they said, were too large and full, and so they might be for a goddess in marble, but not for a woman whose eyes were fire, whose look was love, whose voice was the sweetest low song, whose shape was perfect symmetry, health, decision, activity, whose foot as it planted itself upon the ground was firm but flexible, and whose motion, whether rapid or slow, was always perfect grace—agile as a nymph, lofty as a queen—now melting, now imperious, now sarcastic—there was no single motion of hers but was beautiful. As he thinks of her, he who writes feels young again, and remembers a paragon."

It has been said that Thackeray was himself in love with Beatrix—and what wonder! Why, then, did he introduce beside this glowing picture the altogether uninspiring creation of his pencil, and label it with her name?

If Thackeray was oblivious to his own limitations as an illustrator, he could yet appreciate the shortcomings of the English academicians

and immortalize Boydell's Shakspere as "that black and ghastly gallery of murky Opies, glum Northcotes, straddling Fuselis."

In recent books also, and those of first-class publishing houses, it is easy to find illustrations the important details of which are out of touch with, or even contradictions of, the author's text. This has been especially true of the so-called "flat book," or the elaborate Christmas gift book of so many of our American publishers, but it is by no means restricted to that class. Crawford's "*Katherina Lauderdale*," published by the Macmillans, may be taken as a too common example. The heroine, while not so impossible a female as the creations of "*Harper's Bazar*," is still of such extraordinary stature that she would attract attention were she to appear upon the street. The story affords, however, no warrant for drawing such a figure, and the picture is introduced in the text near where the heroine's mother is described as being "much taller than her daughters." An almost equal example of carelessness in modern book illustration is afforded by Mr. Charles Major's popular love-story, "*When Knighthood Was in Flower*."

A recent writer has said that literary art falls naturally into three classes. In the first class are those pictures in which the literary idea has been inspiration; in the second are those for which it has been a legitimate pretext; and in the third are those in which it has been apparently an afterthought. Since

"In framing an artist, art hath thus decreed
To make some good, but others to exceed,"

we need experience no surprise at finding that all these classes of pictures are represented in modern books. In the first class are all those illustrations to which we instinctively turn as notable successes. One cannot examine Mr. Abbey's charming pictures for "*She Stoops to Conquer*" without feeling that Goldsmith's people live before us in their true guise, and that those things we have felt, but could not express, the artist has portrayed for us. In the language of Mr. Hopkinson Smith: "It is as though artist and poet had worked at the same thing together, not at any vision of the thing as it looked in the other's mind." How different and yet how truly inspired are the humorously articulate drawings of Mr. Frost for the "*Nights with Uncle Remus*." To lovers of the "*Remus*" stories the newly illustrated book brings almost the freshness of a first edition.

I have purposely mentioned these totally different books in close association that I might show the wide range of the illustrator's field of

work. Had Mr. Abbey illustrated Mr. Harris's folk-lore and Mr. Frost the poems of Goldsmith, we can hardly believe that such success would have been attained. Yet the illustrator of only a few years since was expected to portray with equal facility and truthfulness a social event, a county fair, or a railway accident. To-day the illustrator is essentially a specialist who depicts a peculiar phase of life, or, at most, only a very few phases of it.

Thus, Charles Dana Gibson is, *par excellence*, the recorder of social follies and fancies. Into a few strong lines his subtle genius compresses a story which to tell as clearly and vigorously in words would require pages of text. He is not artist alone, but tailor and house-furnisher as well, and his pictures, like those of Smedley and Gilbert, of Hutt, Johnson, and Wenzell, exhibit the up-to-date fashions in dress with all the correctness of the latest Parisian plates. In a totally different field is Joseph Pennell, who has trained his pencil to put upon paper those vignettes of architectural beauty — glimpses from well-chosen coigns of vantage — which before had existed only as the cherished memory-pictures of travellers. Frederic Remington is the artist of the strenuous frontier life, with his lank and sinewy plainsmen and rearing or galloping broncos. His pictures naturally include the American trooper, as do also those of Rufus Zogbaum and Thule de Thulstrup. Howard Pyle has made himself preëminently the illustrator of colonial and fifteenth-century times; and his pupil, Mr. F. C. Yohn, is following in his footsteps. The recognized interpreters of Southern life are A. B. Frost and E. W. Kemble. And so the list might be extended until it included representations of almost every place and time.

This specialization of the illustrator's work necessitates a special training and close study of the surroundings of the objects and characters which are to be portrayed. If an artist is to illustrate a story the scene of which has a definite geographical location, he visits the region and by observation and by sketches familiarizes himself, as far as is possible, with its peculiarities. When Houghton, Mifflin & Company selected Eric Pape to illustrate "The Fair God" of General Wallace, he had in some sense qualified himself for the task by years of sojourn in Egypt, where he had steeped himself in the lore of an ancient people. Before beginning his work, however, he was sent to Central America to sketch topography and flora, and, in the presence of the Aztec monuments, to inhale the atmosphere of his pictures. He then haunted museums of archaeology to examine the collections of Aztec costumes, utensils, and curios which tell of the every-day life of this interesting people.

But the literary man of the present has also his special gifts and his peculiar graces of thought and style; and so it has come about that nearly every prominent illustrator of literature who has been long before the public has become more or less closely identified with one or more of the men of letters of the day. Mr. Gibson has been so long the illuminator for the stories of Richard Harding Davis that when in "The Lion and the Unicorn" are found the excellent pictures of Mr. Howard Chandler Christy, the world of readers is sensible of a distinct surprise. Peter Newell's quaint humor has found its proper field in bringing out the ingenious situations which have originated in the brains of Frank R. Stockton and the late Stephen Crane. Remington has become identified with Owen Wister, Frost with Joel Chandler Harris and Ruth McEnery Stuart, Alice Barber Stephens with Mary E. Wilkins, and so on.

Such collaboration has resulted in the creation of a bond of sympathy between the man of letters and the man of art, as each has come to recognize in its true importance the function of the other. It is on record that a prominent novelist, one of whose stories was recently appearing as a serial in a standard magazine, changed in a notable manner, and with happy results, the physical conception of his heroine, because of the difficulties which would otherwise have arisen in composing the illustrations. That an appreciative illustrator may materially assist the author in introducing his characters and incidents may be inferred also from a recently published letter of James Lane Allen to Orson Lowell, the eminently successful illustrator of "The Choir Invisible." This delicate tribute to the artist-illustrator as a fellow worker is so in contrast with the habitual complaints of authors during a recent period of illustration, that it may well be quoted. In his letter Mr. Allen said:

" . . . Since then a book of mine has lately had the good fortune to be placed in your hands for the purpose of illustration, even the poorest sense of gratitude would constrain me to say how much it has gained through your studious, your beautiful, your truly illuminating art. You have created your own interpretation of the text and imposed it so successfully upon the eye of the author, at least, that he is fain to accept your personages and your incidents as prior realities from which his story was drawn, rather than as later fancies drawn from his story."

The collaboration of author and artist may be looked upon as marking a distinct advance in the field of illustration. A still higher plane should be reached when it is possible to unite in one person the talents of both. Such a combination, it might be expected, would be but rarely met with; yet there has recently come into notice such a truly remarkable group of illustrator-authors as to make the latest decade of the Vic-

torian era a somewhat unique one in the history of literature. The best known of the "society" artists of England, fast approaching the end of the allotted span of life, flashes across the literary horizon with the suddenness almost of a meteor; and, through a genius displayed both by pen and pencil, takes his position in the front rank of contemporary writers of fiction. On this side of the Atlantic, an exquisite artist, whose clever and forceful sketches possess such a human element that even Mr. Abbey regrets that he cannot give to his pictures the same subtle quality, is urged by Mr. Richard Watson Gilder to essay the writing of stories, and her success is immediate. An artist-naturalist, who has devoted his life to a study of the anatomy of animals, tells with pen and pencil what he has learned from his furry friends, with the result that his book is the literary success of the year, and Mr. Kipling, when he visits America, seeks him out as the literary man he most wishes to meet.

Yet George Du Maurier, Mary Hallock Foote, and Ernest Seton Thompson are not alone in the now closely allied fields of literature and illustration. Who has not been charmed by the delightful sketches of Hopkinson Smith — word pictures so like the dreamy creations of his pencil that they can only be considered as parts of a common whole; or who that has ever seen William Hamilton Gibson's vignettes of nature, artistically and cleverly caught in woodland nooks and by wayside fences, and read his pastorals and idyls, has not felt the allurements of a life *au large* in nature's kingdom? The vigorous stories of Howard Pyle, the breezy sketches of Frederic Remington, and the clever conceits of Oliver Herford, likewise carry in each instance their author's illustrations. The advantage held by the illustrator-author has been so manifest that he has received every encouragement from magazine editor and publisher. As if to show how dominant is this feeling, a recent number of "*Harper's Magazine*" was made up almost exclusively of articles by professional artists.

If now we pass in review the several stages of modern book-making, the fact which stands out above all others is the steady evolution of illustration from a mere embellishment of the text to the dignity of a literary performance. It can no longer be regarded as a mere accessory to, but rather as a part of, the book itself; for the modern writer addresses his readers through the text and the illustrations alike. This embodiment of the pictures in the book has required that they be joined to the text in their natural positions, so that the reader's sensation of pleasure may be that of the *tout ensemble*. The French illustrators, who in their best work cover the pages with dainty vignettes, as in the beau-

tiful *Tartarin* books of Alphonse Daudet, have accomplished this result, though their pictures are little more than suggestions. Their method has, however, found but little following in America, where more serious literary pictures are the rule; but increasing care has been exercised to place each illustration in close union with the text which it supplements.

I shall have failed in my purpose if I have not indicated that the drift of modern book-making has been in the direction of that unity in design which must ever be present in a perfect whole. The artist and engraver, who so often worked at cross-purposes, were, through the progress of invention, replaced, first by the artist-engraver, and later by the artist-illustrator. Through an evolution of the latter his work acquired a literary quality which made collaboration with the author inevitable, and to-day we see a marked tendency to unite the two faculties of writing and illustrating wherever this is possible.

The service of art to literature does not end when the illustrations of a book have been embodied in the text. Manuscript and illustrations are, it is true, both the body and the soul of the book; but it is as true here as elsewhere that dress cannot be entirely ignored, and art again becomes the handmaid of literature by fashioning the attire in which the book is to make its appearance before the public. Of the paper which makes up the warp and woof of the garment, it is the province of art to select that which is neither so glaringly white nor so glossily starched as to obtrude itself upon the eye. The pattern of the page and its margin must be suited to the body it adorns, and the design in the types must be both artistic and simple. The outer wrap, in which the book is first to greet the reader, will be the greater success if, besides being cleverly fashioned in harmony with the dress it but partially conceals, it contains also some subtle hint of the personality it is to mantle.

In the modest opinion of the writer, the books of Mr. Ernest Seton Thompson, published by the Century Company and by Charles Scribner's Sons, mark, if all practical questions be taken into account, as high a level as has yet been reached in the bookman's art. The folio Chaucer issued from the Kelmscott Press may be, indeed, the most elegant specimen of a book that was ever published; but in such luxuriance of dress one is apt to forget that the primary object of a book is to be read — not, like an overdressed woman, to be gazed at. Printed on matt-surfaced, tinted paper, the books of Mr. Seton Thompson, through the superbly drawn and appropriate pictures by the author, no less than through the vigorous and artistic marginal sketches — sketches which seem to spring

from the text — delight and satisfy the reader who has been attracted to them by the suggestion of their contents upon the cover.

The topic which I have chosen has naturally led me to confine myself largely to modern book illustration, and especially to American work, since the practice of those who follow is less interesting and may in some measure be inferred from a study of the leaders. For omitting to mention the early school of engravers which flourished in the fifteenth century, and for failing to speak of the revival of wood engraving, under Bewick and others, which occurred in England in the eighteenth century, I take refuge behind my text, claiming that here art did not, in the majority of instances at least, do service to literature. With the exception of Holbein and Hogarth, no great artists were employed to illustrate important literary works until the second revival of engraving in the nineteenth century.

The earliest form of illustrated book was the illuminated manuscript, a most beautiful example of which is the missal of the Emperor Maximilian. The text and illumination of this manuscript are alike the handiwork of that superb artist, Albrecht Dürer. In the long cycle of development which separates his time from the present, the making of a book has increased manifold in complexity, to keep pace with the progress of invention; but we may discern in the present drawing together of author and illustrator an earnest attempt to return to that unity of design which the illuminated book of Dürer so well exemplifies.

WILLIAM HERBERT HOBBS.

WRITERS IN THE MAY FORUM.

MR. ERNEST IRVING ANTRIM was born in Germantown, Ohio, in 1869, and was graduated from DePauw University in 1889. The year following his graduation he attended Boston University, and was awarded the master's degree by that institution. From 1890 to 1894 was a teacher, holding part of that time the chair of English in Wyoming University. In 1894 went to Germany, where he spent three years. Received the degree of Ph.D. from Göttingen University. For several years has been engaged in the banking business and in literary work.

PROF. ARLO BATES was born at East Machias, Me., in 1850. Graduated from Bowdoin College in 1876, and has since received, from the same college, the degrees of A.M. and Litt.D. After graduation settled in Boston. Was for some years engaged in journalism and magazine work, accompanied by more serious efforts in fiction and poetry. His fiction includes "A Wheel of Fire," "The Pagans," "The Puritans," "The Philistines," "Love in a Cloud," etc. In verse Prof. Bates has written a volume of Persian tales, "Told in the Gate," several volumes of lyrics, of which the most recent is called "Under the Beech-Tree," and "Sonnets in Shadow," a memorial to his wife, Harriet Leonora Vose, better known by her pen-name "Eleanor Putnam," and as the author of "Old Salem." Has published also two series of Lowell Institute lectures, "Talks on Writing English" and "Talks on the Study of Literature." Since 1893 has held the chair of English at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

HON. CHARLES DENBY, born in Virginia in 1830, was educated at Georgetown University and at the Virginian Military Institute, graduating from the latter in 1850. Was Lieutenant-Colonel of the Forty-Second Regiment, Indiana Volunteers, and Colonel of the Eighteenth Regiment, Indiana Volunteers. In 1865 Mr. Denby was appointed Minister to China, and remained at Peking in that position until July, 1868. Was a member of the Commission to investigate the conduct of the war with Spain, and also of the Philippine Commission.

LEONORA BECK ELLIS, a Georgian by birth, is a Southern writer, whose first magazine work appeared in the New York and Boston periodicals some five years ago. Since that time has contributed extensively to the magazine literature both of this country and of England. Belonging to one of the old Southern families, Mrs. Ellis stands as an exponent of what is distinctively Southern.

PROF. WILLIAM HERBERT HOBBS is a native of Massachusetts, where he graduated, in 1883, from the Worcester Polytechnic Institute. After a period of graduate study at the Johns Hopkins University, he held the Fellowship in Geology for one year, and was granted the degree of Ph.D. in 1888. Has studied also at Harvard, and at Heidelberg. Since 1889 has been connected with the University of Wisconsin, where he occupies the chair of Mineralogy and Petrology. Prof. Hobbs is the author of a number of scientific papers. At different times has been the Editor, for Mineralogy, of "The American Naturalist," and, as Secretary of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, the Editor of its "Transactions." Has also edited two volumes of "The Science Series of the Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin."

MR. GUSTAV KOBBE was born in New York in 1857. Was graduated from Columbia College in 1877, and from the Columbia Law School in 1879. Studied music under the late Joseph Mosenthal. Is a musical and dramatic critic, is author of "Wagner's Life and Works," and a frequent contributor to the magazines.

PRINCE PETR ALEXEIEVITCH KROPOTKIN was born in December, 1842. Attended St. Petersburg University from 1869 to 1873. Received gold medal of Russian Geographical Society for journey across North Manchuria in 1864. Explored glacial deposits in Finland and Sweden in 1871. Joined International Workingmen's Assoc-

ation in 1872; arrested and confined in fortress St. Peter and St. Paul, 1874; escaped from military hospital, 1876; went to England; founded the anarchist paper "Le Révolté"; expelled from Switzerland, 1881; condemned at Lyons to five years' imprisonment, 1883; liberated in 1886. Is the author of numerous publications.

MR. WILBUR LARREMORE was born in New York City in 1855. Graduated from the College of the City of New York and from the Law School of Columbia University. Is a practising lawyer devoting much time to the trial of cases as Referee. Since 1890 has been Editor of the "New York Law Journal," the official legal paper of New York city. Has contributed articles to the "Harvard Law Review" and other legal periodicals, as well as verse and essays to the magazines.

MR. JOHN MARTIN was born in Lincoln, England, in 1864. After graduating at a Teachers' Training College in London, entered the University and took the degree of Bachelor of Science. Served for six years on the Executive Board of the Fabian Society. During the same period sat on the Hackney Borough Council, a body which administers the local affairs of 220,000 persons in that section of London. Mr. Martin came to the United States on a tour of lecturing and investigation, in the autumn of 1898. The next year became Secretary of the League for Political Education, New York. Has taken up his residence in New York, where he is actively interested in the initiation of such a municipal policy as he has seen developing, with remarkable success, in London.

PROF. WILLIAM S. SCARBOROUGH, born in Macon, Georgia, in 1852, received his early education in private and public schools of that city; entering Atlanta University in 1869, and Oberlin College in 1871. Graduated in 1875 from the classical department, with the degree of A.B., and received the honorary degree of A.M. in 1879. Has also received the honorary degrees of LL.D. and Ph.D. Was called, in 1877, to Wilberforce University, Xenia, Ohio, to take the chair of Latin and Greek, which he filled until 1891, when he was transferred to Payne Theological Seminary at the same place, to fill the chair of New Testament Greek and Literature. In 1897 again took the former chair and was made Vice-President of Wilberforce University, which position he now holds. Prof. Scarborough is the author of many essays on classical subjects, of "First Lessons in Greek," the only Greek book ever written by a negro, and of numerous works relative to the Negro Question.

MR. ALBERT WATKINS was born in Worcester, England, in 1848, and removed to Wisconsin the following year. Graduated from the University of Wisconsin in both the academic and the law department. Subsequently became interested in, and editor of, the Mineral Point, Wis., "Democrat," the Sioux City, Iowa, "Tribune," and the "Daily State Democrat," of Lincoln, Neb. Was always a strong advocate of "sound money." Was postmaster of Lincoln from 1885 to 1891. Opposed Mr. Bryan on the silver question as early as 1892, and quit the Democratic party in 1896, on that issue. Was a delegate to the Indianapolis Convention of 1896; acting as a member of the sub-committee on platform, and taking an active part in drafting resolutions.

MR. EARLEY VERNON WILCOX was born in Jamestown, N. Y., in 1869. Finished the high-school course at Jamestown. Received the degree of A.B. at Otterbein College, Ohio, in 1890, and three degrees from Harvard — A.B., 1892, A.M., 1894, and Ph.D., 1895. Was Assistant Entomologist for one year at the Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, and Professor of Biology for three years at the Montana Experiment Station. Was detailed in 1900 by the Department of Agriculture to investigate the poisonous plants of Montana. Is at present Associate Editor of the "Experiment Station Record."

MR. MARRION WILCOX was born in Georgia in 1858. Was educated at Yale University, graduating thence in 1878. Is an LL.B. of Hamilton College, and has been admitted to the New York Bar. Has studied history abroad, and was an instructor at Yale University. Since 1893 has been writer and editor in New York city. Is the author of "A Short History of the War with Spain," and of a "History of the War in the Philippines."

PROF. THEODORE S. WOOLSEY was graduated from Yale in 1872. In 1879 was appointed Professor of International Law in Yale Law School. Has edited Pomeroy's and Woolsey's treatises upon International Law.

THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXI, NO. 4.

JUNE, 1801.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

**COPYRIGHT, 1900.
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.**

PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
82, 84 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK

The Forum

J U N E , 1901.

GOVERNING THE ORIENT ON WESTERN PRINCIPLES.

THE idea of endowing an inferior or backward race with the institutions of a more highly developed civilization has at present a great charm for the American people. It will, therefore, be well to inquire how far attempts to accomplish this result have been successful in the past, especially in India and other parts of the Orient brought under European influence. An inquiry of this nature, while not establishing any unyielding precedents of action, will at least tend to reveal certain circumstances which cannot well be disregarded in determining upon a policy adapted to an Oriental population. The experience of the English in India, highly suggestive in this connection, affords a remarkable example of how, in dealing with alien races, the best intentions may lead to the worst results. It is truly the land of deceived hopes, the "land of regrets," and every reader of Kipling's Indian stories will instinctively feel the nature of these disappointments. The British have succeeded to a noteworthy degree in giving India peace and material prosperity, but any hopes that were entertained for achievements beyond this have been thwarted. The ideal of Wilberforce and Macaulay, that the populations of the Orient should be led, through education and representative government, toward the progressive civilization of the West, has encountered the dogged opposition of a static society. Since the day of these men the Government has confined its efforts entirely to a policy of maintaining peace and fostering material development, in other respects leaving the customs and institutions of the natives very much as they formerly were.

Permission to republish articles is reserved.

In matters of religion the policy of the Government has been one of perfect neutrality. Originally, missionary work was not even permitted in India. Later, during the first half of the nineteenth century, the Government fostered and protected the ceremonies of the native religions. But during the last decades all interference on the part of the Government has been discontinued. The rites and endowments of the native religions are administered exclusively by the native priesthood.

Among the three great religions of India, Brahmanism is the most comprehensive system of belief. Whatever may be the character of worship, whether it be an idealization of humanity or a primitive fetishism, it is readily received into this pantheon, as a manifestation of the same homage of mankind for the idea. But, in proportion as this religion is broad and tolerant toward forms of belief, so is it narrow in respect to social organization. The Brahman caste system is certainly the most terrible chain ever laid upon mankind. Three thousand mutually exclusive castes, from which there is no escape, unless through a complete change of religion and loss of social position, bind men to a set of social ceremonies and observances which practically enslave them through life, and are accompanied with such pecuniary expenditures that they entail the economic dependence of the poorer classes. Like Buddhism, this religion inculcates mildness of manners, and especially clemency toward animals. Its most important religious belief is that of the transmigration of souls. This terrible fantasm of the eternal recurrence of existence, of a never-ceasing rotation, is the secret of the deadening influence of Brahmanism upon individuality. We can see how the doctrine of Buddha may constitute a gospel to people accustomed to such a belief: the idea that after all there is an end, a death, a final forgetting of all the troubles and woes of existence, was to Orientals as joyful tidings as the gospel of eternal life to the early Christians. This also shows why the success of Christian missions among these people will be but moderate until their whole way of thinking is transformed. The doctrine of an eternal existence has no fascination for these millions who have been accustomed to the terrifying thought of unending life and ever-recurring birth. Still, during the past century, indirectly Christianity has had a great influence upon Brahmanism in strengthening the monotheistic currents in that system. As early as 1830 the Brahmo Somaj, the society of one God, was formed, and its influence in restoring the old monotheistic idea of the Vedic literature has been most powerful. At the same time, the more personal relations between divinity and the individual have been emphasized. But Brahmanism shows no tendency

to give up its idea of the all-pervading character of the deity; that is, it remains pantheistic and refuses to individualize God.

Mohammedanism, the second great religion of India, is on all points opposed to the Brahman system. It is strictly monotheistic, intolerant of divergent forms, and, in its social organization, democratic. All believers are equal before the law, and there is no legal nobility. For that reason this religion at present still draws largely from the lower castes in India, to whom a change of faith thus means a liberation from caste tyranny. Missionary propaganda is carried on with the greatest energy; and the methods of Christian evangelists, in preaching and distributing tracts, are in general use. The question of the solidarity of Islam throughout the world is of the very greatest political importance. Through modern means of communication and the newspaper press, this solidarity is becoming stronger every day; and the Mohammedans of India are taking a keen interest in the affairs of their co-religionists in Africa, Turkey, and Russia. It is not too much to say that this vast body of fanatic believers is preparing itself for concerted action, and that, if they continue to develop a national spirit, the Mohammedans will decide the future not only of Asia, but of the world. Or, to put it in different language, the ability to hold them in check and to manage them will constitute the stepping stone to the mastery of the Orient. This fact explains the great solicitude of both Britain and Russia toward the faithful of Islam. In her whole policy, England must constantly keep in view her Mohammedan subjects in India. She cannot afford openly to offend or to thwart the Sultan of Turkey, whom most Moslemites look upon as the secular head of their religion. This point may yet be of cardinal importance in the Egyptian question, should the Sultan decide by his own impulse, or be prevailed upon by England's rivals, to emphasize his rights of suzerainty over the Khedive. The tolerance of Russia for the Mohammedan faith is explained by the same reason. Unless Russia can conciliate Islam, she can never think of conquering India or of establishing herself firmly in any part of southern Asia.

The earlier attempts of the British to interfere in matters of religion were ended by the Sepoy revolt of 1857, which was largely caused by the fear of the Hindoos that they were to be rapidly Europeanized. By her special command, Queen Victoria in 1858 established the policy of non-interference in native religious affairs. But while the Government has given up the idea of a sudden and radical change, liberal philosophy in England has been strong enough to uphold the idea of a gradual assimilation through education. Upon the establishment of Western

schools in India followed the creation of a native press; that, in turn, demanded representative institutions. But the hope that the Indian people might be led to some measure of self-government has been cruelly deceived. So unsuccessful have these measures been in building up national feeling and making national action possible, that hostile critics of England assert that they were devised merely to cause bitter dissensions among the races and religions of India, and to enable Great Britain to follow the policy of *divide et impera*.

It was Macaulay's belief that a race could not be politically assimilated without being given the language and general culture of the governing nation. Hence, there was devised for the Hindoos, through Sir Charles Wood, a system of education based upon English models. At Madras, Bombay, Calcutta, and other towns, examining universities were established. These give periodical tests in the classics, English, history, and the natural sciences, to the aspiring youth of India, who have been educated in the affiliated colleges. The docile race of Hindoos, unwarlike and fond of intellectual pursuits, took very readily to this change, — especially as it led to a career, modest, to be sure, but stable, in the Indian administration. But it has been found that most of the students, gifted as they are with marvellous Oriental memories, put on Western learning like a cloak, and do not permit it to influence the true fibre of their intellect and character. They will memorize volumes of translations or treatises upon history, and astonish the examiners with detailed knowledge; but, like Orientals in general, they lack originality. The successful candidates enter the administration as subordinate clerks. Those who fail often become the victims of hopeless despondency, which leads at times even to suicide. Out of such native elements there is formed a docile bureaucracy, methodical, systematic, and fond of statistics and cumbersome reports, with which they fill the central offices to overflowing. The Mohammedans have in general refused to attend the Europeanized schools, and they likewise refuse to be governed in any manner by Hindoo officials, whom they despise as slave-born and unwarlike. The native press is recruited very largely from dissatisfied elements among the educated; and it is, therefore, given over to stirring up animosities between the natives and the English, and between the different religions and races in the Empire.

The year 1884 saw the last great manifestation of Liberalism in England. The influence of the Ministry was at that time used for extending the system of representative government to the colonies. Jamaica and Mauritius were given representative assemblies. In India elective

Municipal Councils were created, and a National Congress was for the first time convoked. The latter, to be sure, is purely advisory and deliberative, but it has always cherished the greatest hopes and aspirations for true national self-government. As it is, however, its existence has led only to accentuated racial hostility. When the Congress declared itself in favor of national elections by general suffrage, the Mohammedans immediately withdrew. As they are in the minority, they would under such a system be ruled by the Hindoos, and to this they would never peacefully submit. As a matter of fact, representative institutions are impossible in a country where no national parties can exist. In India the line of cleavage will always be along religious divisions; and the adoption of the electoral system would mean government by members of the most numerous religion, Hindooism. In the Municipal Councils, established in 1884, Mohammedans and the Christian merchants and industrials are practically unrepresented, and the Hindoos there, as in the National Congress, consume the time with fruitless criticism and vague discussions, without doing any practical work of government. These assemblies are in fact permanent indignation meetings. For this reason, and on account of the fierce party dissensions, the Government has within the last five years been forced to suspend elections in nearly thirty of the municipalities of India. Indeed, the system of electoral representation is at present being abandoned in all the tropical colonies of Europe.

One of the most deplorable results of these attempted reforms is the growing inter-racial hostility, the accentuated mutual hatred of Hindoos and Moslems. The English, moreover, have practically formed themselves into a caste, the highest caste, even above the priestly Brahmans. The intercourse between the conquerors and the people is, therefore, becoming more and more distant and formal. Unlike the older Anglo-Indians, the present British officials do not allow themselves to become attached to India, but remain English through frequent returns to the mother country. The case of Lord Roberts, "Bobs Bahadur," who spent forty years in the Indian service, is so rare as to excite comment, although it would not have been unusual at an earlier period.

The principal glory of the English régime in India has been that it has established the equal enforcement of law and justice; but even here there are unsuspected drawbacks. Jury trial among the natives, for instance, is made difficult of administration, because they will not dissociate themselves from their prejudices or instinctive likings. For the same reason, it is impossible to obtain reliable testimony. Two large

parties of men will appear before the magistrate and swear to directly opposite statements of fact; leaving the judge to gather the truth by an exercise of intuition. The fact is that Hindoos cannot be brought to look upon giving testimony as anything else than compurgation in support of the oath of their relative or fellow townsman. To swear the truth in cases where it would support their opponent or enemy would appear to them preposterous and "akin to madness." The use of the jury system has led to another grave difficulty. European jurors refuse to convict a white man guilty of the murder of a native. These juries are mostly composed of men of the lower middle class, among whom the arrogance of the imperial race is most potent and apparent. The native papers, as a result, constantly inveigh against the rulers of the country for giving themselves practical immunity from the law.

In still another way has the equal enforcement of the law in the Orient brought unexpected results, namely, in connection with the strict enforcement of the payment of debts. Before the European occupation creditors were not permitted to extort their claims in years of famine or distress. Moreover, usurers were periodically obliged to disgorge, and fill the coffers of the prince, much to the relief of the tax-payers. But with the strict enforcement of law, the business of the usurer has become an exceedingly profitable one; especially in years of want will he enrich himself by the forfeitures of his defaulting debtors. In this manner the lands of India are gradually passing into the hands of the money-lenders. In the Northwest Provinces almost half of the real property is already owned by this class. The same thing occurs in all countries where a population which has to live up to the limit of its resources is brought under the strict enforcement of contract law. The peasant is too weak in this economic struggle. Unless he is protected by legislation like that of the Dutch in Java, which absolutely forbids a native to sell or mortgage his property, he will sooner or later become a victim to his necessities. When we come into undisputed possession of the Philippine Islands, it will be one of our most urgent duties to protect the peasant proprietor from encroachment by the exploiting capitalist.

In this manner many things that were meant for the best have turned out ill, if not in general, at least in respect to some classes. Strict justice has further impoverished the poor. A liberal education has led to a superficially acquired culture, and a cumbersome system of administration. A free press and public representation but accentuate the obstacles in the way of the growth of a free nationality. While we know that these measures have been the result of the liberal ideals of British policy, still

their effect has been such that the hostile critics of Great Britain may claim that she has deliberately set about to impoverish her subjects and to sow dissensions among the different races, in order to fasten her authority upon them.

Considering all this, we cannot escape the conclusion that our Western ideas of political organization are utterly unadapted to the Orient, and that, when applied, they often lead to the opposite result from that intended. The political complexion of the Orient is a theocratic absolutism combined with local self-government. This absolutism, the expression of divine will and the result of custom, is itself bound by divine law and customary observance. Thus, the ruler of old India had to move within the limits of the Brahman law; in China, Confucianism fixes the functions of government; while the Sultan of Turkey must yield to the commands of the Koran as interpreted by the Turkish pope, the Sheik of the Islam. Local self-government is protected by this customary law, and so in Oriental countries there is very little interference by the central governments in ordinary affairs. But, should the ruler decide to act in any particular case, his authority is unquestioned, and punishment, death, and disgrace are taken at his hand with the same fatalism with which the Oriental suffers disease and misfortune.

Indeed, every Oriental ruler looks upon himself, and is regarded by his people, as a direct representative of God. He claims direct relationship with divinity, and he is accorded the deepest personal loyalty by his subjects. Alexander, the conqueror of the Orient, knew what he was about when he declared himself the son of the great God Ammon; and when Napoleon, two thousand years later, followed in the steps of the great Macedonian tamer of horses and men, he was glad to make use of a legend which foretold the return of the proud Iskander in the person of a Frankish hero. Even to-day, in the native states of India, the princes are literally worshipped by their subjects. The Chinese, a most rationalistic and business-like people, revere their Emperor as the representative of Heaven; believe that the soil of their country is sacred; and regard the government as appointed to counsel and lead them in all matters after the eternal wisdom. The natives of the Dutch colonies in Java and Sumatra bow reverently before the statue of the Queen of Holland; and a similar religious feeling manifested itself in India toward the late Empress. At the time of her last jubilee an Indian paper said: "The Indian people are, by nature and by virtue of their religious principles, more loyal than Englishmen. Indian loyalty is a hundred times deeper and sincerer than English loyalty. In England

the Queen is only a constitutional monarch. In India she is a goddess incarnate."

The great possibilities inherent in this sentiment are just now dawning upon Englishmen; and they hope to turn it into a harmonizing bond among all the various creeds and races of India. While representative institutions cannot build up the feeling of nationality and solidarity, the sentiment of loyalty to an Emperor, of personal attachment to a revered master, can be utilized as a unifying principle. It is urged, with great truth, that her religious Czardom gives Russia the greatest advantage in dealing with Orientals, and that England, to hold her own, must develop a similar institution. Although it may at first seem amusing to think of Edward VII as a son of Heaven and the emblem of all divine virtue, we can readily imagine a Hindoo multitude kneeling before his image and doing worship to "His Imperial Highness." Mr. Theodore Morrison, in his "Imperial Rule in India," goes so far as to say: "We should be willing to forego some of the liberties at home which impede our sway in India." This brief statement will most potently reveal to us the influence which the successful maintenance of Oriental empire must inevitably entail upon a Western nation. To a certain extent it must modify its domestic institutions to meet the exigencies of Oriental society. Formerly the English were prone to complain that the Indians were so little thankful for the blessings of orderly government and material progress which they enjoy under the British régime. They are coming to see now that the only method of attaching Oriental populations is through the principle of personal loyalty. An absolute monarch, with a loyal following of leading men, strictly enforcing his will, but in general leaving the local communities to manage their own affairs—that is the ideal form of government in the Orient.

We cannot sufficiently emphasize the universality of local self-government throughout the East. Oriental despotism does not mean constant governmental interference. The despot is irresistible when he acts; but he will not choose to act contrary to the general customs of the realm, because these customs are sacred, and on their sacredness his own customary authority depends. The chief functions of the central Government are consequently taxation and defence. Ordinary affairs are left largely to the local communities. We must, however, avoid the mistake of reading our individualistic ideas into this system. In the Orient the individual is nothing, the family, guild, or caste is everything; so that there local self-determining societies coexist with the greatest social tyranny. The birth of an individual determines his so-

cial position, his profession, his religion. In China and India the trades of house industry are inherited from generation to generation, and the strict customs of the guild are never departed from. The Hindoos would consider it unnatural that the son should not follow the occupation for which he had been prepared by his ancestry. These closely organized local societies manage their own affairs with very little interference by the central Government. The most democratic of the Asiatics are the fighting races, like the Turkomans and Pathans; but institutions of local self-government exist throughout the Orient. In India they have to a large extent been destroyed by a mistaken policy of centralization; but since 1858 it has been the unswerving purpose of England to leave a constantly larger area to self-administration, in the form of native states. In these, England simply regulates the finances and the army, and leaves the entire local administration to the native officials.

The system was first developed by the Dutch in Java, where the native society, with all its princes and other political dignitaries and all its customs of government, was preserved intact. The Dutch merely placed by the side of each native chieftain a resident whose advice became controlling, but who never openly interfered with the course of administration; so that the natives were left in the belief that they retained their old rulers. It was the constant policy of Holland to prevent all disturbance to the settled society, and scrupulously to abstain from all attempts at assimilation. In a similar manner the Russians preserve the local institutions in Central Asia; and even France has learned in the rough school of historical experience that she cannot make Parisians of the Indo-Chinese. She is now gradually adopting the policy of leaving native customs and institutions undisturbed. Governor Doumer of Indo-China, one of the most successful of her colonial statesmen, says, in a recent report to his Government, that it is imperative to refrain from all interference with the customs and religion of the natives. What a change since 1885, when Paul Bert proclaimed the French "rights of man" in the native towns upon his accession to the Governorship of Tonkin! The French have carried the policy of assimilation very far; they have even introduced representative institutions with manhood suffrage in their colonies of Martinique, Guadeloupe, Senegal, and French India; but their experience has been such as to discourage all further efforts in this direction. In Tunis, on the other hand, where they have adopted the model of a protectorate without interference with local institutions, they have scored the one success of their colonial policy.

It is, however, in Spanish colonial politics that the idea of assimilation has been carried farthest. In accordance with her Latin character, it was Spain's first effort to make the natives adopt her own religion, institutions, customs, and dress. All local and tribal organization was destroyed, and the social life was fitted into a rigid autocratic mechanism. As a result of this assimilation, of this creation of a tax-gathering machine, the life of the colonies was sterilized, and their loss became but a question of time. An entirely different policy was pursued by Holland and England in Ceylon and Java, perhaps the most successful colonies in the Orient. In these islands the population, though increasing very rapidly, is living in great material comfort and happiness. The inherited customs have not been interfered with; and the natives are protected against exploitation, though they have no elective institutions. Representation in the colonial councils is by appointment; and in every appointment the local interests, both racial and industrial, are considered. What these regions need is not politics, but wise and experienced administration; not assimilation, but sympathy and assistance in achieving their peculiar destiny. The best, and, in fact, the only possible, manner of conciliating the natives of any country to a régime of foreign control is to respect the native characteristics, and to appoint as governors men who have the natural gift to command, who will be obeyed as readily and as willingly as was Lord Roberts in India, because they are gentlemen and born to leadership. Moreover, the road to power must not be closed to able and ambitious native leaders who have legitimate influence among their countrymen. Even to-day the memory of Akbar is revered in India, because he made Hindoos governors of provinces; and it is in this way that Russia is gaining the good will of her subject populations.

How do these considerations bear upon the broader question of ultimate supremacy in Asia? It is certain that Russia to-day feels herself the appointed mediator between the Orient and the West, and that she believes that destiny has called *her* to lead the swarming peoples of the Orient into a higher civilization. Characteristic expressions of this belief are common, but none can be more weighty than those of a great Russian prince and of a famous general. In his proclamation on the day after the terrible slaughter at Geok Teppe, when the power of the Turkmans had been broken forever, General Skobeleff said:

“A new era has opened for the Tekkes, an era of equality and of guaranteed possession of property for all, without distinction. Our Central Asian policy recognizes no pariahs. Herein lies our superiority over the English.”

In the same year he wrote:

"England lays a heavy hand upon her dependent peoples. She reduces them to a state of slavery, only that English trade may flourish and Englishmen grow rich. Thousands of natives in India only await Russia's crusade for deliverance. Russia gives full liberty to native customs."

The other authority is one of the principal exponents of the Asiatic policy of Russia, Prince Oukhtomsky, the President of the Russo-Chinese Bank and editor of the "Journal of St. Petersburg." He accompanied the Czarowitch Nicholas on his voyage through the Orient; and, in recounting his experiences, he gave a characteristic expression of the attitude of Russia toward Asia. "Asia," he says, "we have always belonged to it. We have lived its life, and felt its interests. Through us the Orient has gradually arrived at consciousness of itself, at a superior life." He finds endless points of similarity between the Orient and Russia. An Englishman in India is in a strange country; to the Russian, however, Asia is home; the Asiatics are his brothers. Continuing he writes:

"We have nothing to conquer. All these peoples of various races feel themselves drawn to us, and are our brothers by blood, by tradition, and by ideas. We simply approach them more closely. This great and mysterious Orient is ready to become ours."

He holds the same view as Skobeleff on the character of English government in Asia. "The English," he says, "lack that broad generosity by which the Russians admit natives to high commands. India is full of unhappiness and misery."

Examples of this nature might be indefinitely multiplied; but those above given sufficiently indicate the attitude and temper of the Russian mind, and as such they are documents of great practical importance. This does not say that they are true. It is not at all certain that the Indian masses would rise impulsively to welcome the Russian deliverer from British dominion. Nor is the treatment which the Russians accord the Asiatics always that of brotherly love. The cruelty of their conquests is proverbial, and they do not spare the heavy hand on other occasions. But opinions like the above are the basis of the Russian policy in Asia. It is, moreover, certainly true that the customs and institutions of Russia bear a close analogy to those of Asia, and that the Russian peasant, as he gradually penetrates into the far East, does not discover anything that is absolutely foreign to him. From the cupolas of the Kremlin to the pagodas of Peking the transition is very gradual. The religious autocracy of the Russian central government, the local autonomy of the *mir*, and the external system of ceremonies of the Russian

religion — these all readily lend themselves to extension into the Orient. The beliefs among the masses are largely of a formal and superstitious nature. The cult of St. Nicholas and the Virgin, the belief in forest and river spirits, and the use of amulets and incantations place the Russian peasant on a plane from which he will readily understand the beliefs and superstitions of the Orientals. Dogmatic theology plays no part in his religion. Of the greatest importance in this connection is the splendor of the religious functions connected with the Czardom. The representatives of all the Oriental peoples subject to Russia, who assemble to witness a coronation, are impressed with the divine attributes of the Czar; and their belief in his irresistible power becomes almost instinctive.

The democratic basis of her autocracy will also be a great help to Russia in the Orient. Asia is the land of the common people; and, notwithstanding its vast over-population, the life of the ordinary people is perhaps happier there than anywhere else, as their horizon is limited and they are easily contented. Pleasures are cheap and are indulged in with zest. Who could ever forget Lafcadio Hearn's description of the festivities of the Japanese people, prepared with no expense, and still so full of beauty and joy? The secret of all this is that art has not been taken out of the life of the common people; that folklore is not dead as it is in the West. Throughout the Orient the house industry still exists and the people who manufacture the beautiful rugs, the delicate textiles, the artistic pottery of the Orient, certainly have a more pleasant occupation than the operatives in our factories, with the dull and soul-killing routine of machine work. When we think of the rich folklore of the East, of the poetic fancies which are handed down from generation to generation, of the intense hero-worship among the masses, how poor and dreary appears the life of the working people in our large cities, though as far as material comforts go they are usually far better provided.

The mystic element is the strongest in Oriental life. The Oriental would rather imagine and interpret than understand. He does not long to lift the veil of mystery that shrouds religion and authority. In this respect, too, Russia is strong. As her great Dostoevski has said: "Russia cannot be understood; she must be believed in." The Orientals are ready to believe in anything that surrounds itself with splendor and the emblems of authority.

With our practical Western nature, it is difficult for us to understand the spirituality of the Orient. Spirit is everywhere; the poorest Hindoo peasant constantly feels its immanence. To the Chinese, air and

soil are peopled with genii. The Japanese build delicate temples in woodland glades. No human being ever enters them; but many gaze reverently through the latticed windows into the twilight silence within, where abide the ghosts of divinities and of noble men. Perhaps the highest and purest expression of this belief is found in the readiness for hero-worship among Oriental nations, and especially among the people of India. The great man, the noble character, is a direct impersonation of the divine spirit; and to worship him appears a most natural thought. Thus, the Oriental feels himself surrounded on all sides by spiritual forces, by whose influence his life is moulded.

The one important conception which the Oriental mind lacks is that these mysterious and all-powerful manifestations are themselves governed by a great law. The reign of natural law is foreign to the Orientals, who live under a tyranny of capricious spirits. The idea of gradual, orderly development according to a universal rule, the cosmos of the physical world, they cannot conceive. How can the Oriental mind be endowed with this idea? Many believe that race characteristics are so persistent that the Orient will never lose its mystic character. It seems, however, beyond doubt that a continued introduction of the mechanical appliances and processes of the West must necessarily lead Orientals to a complete change in their philosophy of life. Thus in a measure may they repeat the experience of the ancient Pagan world as set forth by the poet Shelley:

"Swift as the radiant shapes of sleep
 From one whose dreams are Paradise
 Fly, when the fond wretch wakes to weep,
 And Day peers forth with her blank eyes;
 So fleet, so faint, so fair,
 The Powers of Earth and Air
 Fled from the folding-star of Bethlehem:
 Apollo, Pan, and Love,
 And even Olympian Jove,
 Grew weak, for killing Truth had glared on them.
 Our hills and seas and streams,
 Dispeopled of their dreams,
 Their waters turned to blood, their dew to tears,
 Wailed for the golden years."

A radical change in the character of Oriental thought and life would deeply affect and might even endanger the entire world. The Oriental societies have existed for thousands of years. They have assumed a fixed and apparently unchangeable character. The dissolution of this stability through the introduction of the mechanism of Western

civilization would not only disturb the philosophical ideas of the Orientals, but would also create an army of anarchistical revolutionaries. Such was the character of the Boxers. As Mgr. Favier has remarked, they were pure communists, *sans culottes*. Fanatical hordes, freed from the restraint of their inherited social laws, scourged into bitter dissatisfaction by the loss of their livelihood through the introduction of machinery, will be ready to burn, rob, and murder indiscriminately the rich of their own nation and foreign intruders. Therefore, the application of these progressive methods of thought and action to a static society is fraught with the greatest danger. Whether these societies can ever be made progressive in a Western sense is, indeed, very questionable. For eons they have been stationary and mystical; and even among the Japanese, Western civilization is but a thin veneer.

It would seem, then, that it is not well to be too optimistic, to raise our hopes and expectations too high, in the matter of civilizing the Orient according to Western standards, and of allowing alien races to participate in the benefits of our institutions. We should rather give attention to the inborn psychological characteristics of these populations, and make sure what effect the launching at them of our peculiar ideas and methods will have before we attempt a work of wholesale regeneration. Whether the introduction of Western industrialism will have a profound influence on the character of the Orientals has not as yet become apparent; and still this is the only promising avenue of approach. In matters of thought and religion, the belief of the Orientals in the superiority of their own civilization is practically unshaken.

PAUL S. REINSCH.

THE WORK OF THE CUBAN CONVENTION.

THE United States occupied the island of Cuba as a Government of Intervention after clearly and solemnly announcing its purpose in the terms of the now familiar Joint Resolution of April 20, 1898, the special propositions of which were:

"That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island, except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people."

American sympathy for a struggling people had been stirred by harrowing tales of Spanish atrocity, and a spirit of vengeance had been roused by the disaster to the *Maine*. For several weeks prior to the passage of this Resolution, President McKinley had been striving to effect an armistice between Spain and her rebellious colony. While such a step might have met the approval of that large percentage of Cubans whose desire was autonomy or some measure of self-government under the Spanish flag, it was rejected by those belligerents whose cry was always "*Independencia ó muerte*."

The message of President McKinley to Congress, under date of April 11, 1898, makes no mention of Cuban independence. In the "name of humanity and civilization," and because of "menace to American interests," he asked authority to use the forces of the United States for the purpose of quickly and effectively terminating the hostilities, and for assuring the establishment of a stable government in the island. While American intervention may have been looked for and hoped for by many Cubans, at no time had Cuba or its representatives asked for that intervention. They had asked, and practically demanded, recognition of their rights as belligerents. For intervention they did not ask. Knowing the position of matters in Washington, the trend of Mr. McKinley's message, and the terms of that message, the Cubans saw before them but two courses: either annexation to the United States or autonomy of some kind under Spanish domination. Neither of these was acceptable to the

fighting Cubans, who, through their representatives, then demanded that, in the event of the proposed intervention, the United States should definitely and distinctly declare the independence of the island. Failing that, it was declared that the interveners would be regarded as intruders, and that their intrusion would be resisted. The Joint Resolution was framed in response to this demand. The original text of the Resolution provided for the recognition of the "Republic of Cuba as the true and lawful Government of the island." After thorough debate, this clause was struck out, and the bill became a law, which met with little opposition or protest from the American people. It was many months before any serious note of objection to it was heard.

By the Protocol of August, 1898, Spain renounced her claim to sovereignty over the island of Cuba. On January 1, 1899, under the provisions of the Treaty of Paris, the date of which was December 10, 1898, Spain ceased her official occupation of the island, and the United States assumed possession, as a Government of Intervention, "for the pacification thereof." That pacification being accomplished, the United States, by its own declaration, was to leave the "government and control of the island to its people."

Two years and more have passed, and a then friendly and cordial Cuba has become, in large measure, a hostile Cuba. Assuming the standard of successful government to be a contented and reasonably happy people, trusting, honoring, and respecting their governor, America has failed in her experience in Cuba. Absorbed in personal and in national interests which presented features of greater immediate importance, the great majority of the American people have kept in but vague and general touch with Cuban affairs. The occasional complaints and rumors of discontent were generally assumed to be trivial and unavoidable, the natural result of a period of reorganization. Reports came announcing that the hungry had been fed, and that provision had been made for the sick and the homeless. Other reports indicated a remarkable measure of industrial rehabilitation. There were no riots and no revolts. All of these statements were facts. It was, therefore, assumed that all was well in the island, and busy America turned her thoughts and her interests in other directions. The recent developments have come as a surprise to many, if not to the great majority, of the American people. In what lies the cause, immediate or more remote, of a condition which is, at its best expression, most unfortunate, and where lies the blame for it?

The "pacification" of Cuba may be said to have been effected within the first six months of American occupation. There was no one, except

the United States, whom the Cubans could fight, and there was no inclination to pick a quarrel with such a power. There was no disposition to fight among themselves. It remains a question whether it was not the duty of, and whether it would not have been wiser for, the United States to have then set on foot the processes of an independent government. No expressed legislation bound us to the establishment of a "stable government." That figure of speech occurs only in the message of the President, which does not constitute a law. "Stable government" is a condition for which due provision may be made, but which cannot be guaranteed by constitutional or legislative enactment. The United States is responsible for the proper maintenance of peace, law, and order, in Cuba, by virtue of the very act which originally took her to the island, namely, the effective termination of a state of disorder which had become an "offence to civilization," and "intolerable" to the American people.

The first year of American occupation saw the affairs of the island administered by General John R. Brooke, a soldier with a soldier's training and experience. As might have been expected his régime was not a notable success. The authorities in Washington had formulated no policy regarding the method of administration, and the only policy pursued was one of drift and opportunism. During the year there developed to some extent in Cuba a sentiment in favor of annexation. In the United States a similar tendency could be observed among a class of persons not large numerically, but representing financial and commercial interests not to be easily ignored in politics. Advantage was taken by this element of every possible argument against Cuban independence, and in favor of the permanent retention of that which, by an approved act of legislation, had been declared "free and independent." There are many who believe that General Brooke's removal, at the end of the year, was effected for the purpose of advancing the annexation movement. Others believe it to have been due to his general unfitness for such a position, and to the fact that affairs in Cuba were, even then, in an unsatisfactory condition.

General Brooke was followed by General Leonard Wood, whose appointment was due, in part, to the personal interest of the President in that officer, and, in part, to a widespread supposition that the appointee had displayed in Santiago Province administrative qualities which marked him as fitted for the larger post. In spite of the vast amount of work accomplished along philanthropic, sanitary, and educational lines, the second year of American administration closed upon a condition even more unsatisfactory than existed at the close of the first year. The things

which had been done were things which it was well to have done, but they were not the things which the Cubans most wanted, and the doing of them was a cause of discontent rather than of satisfaction. If anything, General Wood had really made fewer friends and more enemies for the United States than had General Brooke.

On April 18, 1900, there was issued Civil Order No. 164, which provided an electoral law and directed the holding of an election for the establishment of self-governing municipalities throughout the island. At about the same time, the matter of the American Presidential election began to take shape; and it became evident that the Democratic party was planning, as a part of its campaign, an attack upon the administration for having continued American military government in the island of Cuba, thereby failing to carry out the terms of the Joint Resolution of April, 1898. Probably for the reason that this threatened attack constituted a somewhat serious menace to the political supremacy of the Republican party, rather than from any other cause, it was decided to make a further provision for self-government in Cuba, by calling a Constitutional Convention. This call was issued, under date of July 25, 1900, as Civil Order No. 301. After rehearsing the essential clauses of the Joint Resolution, that Order proceeds as follows:

"And, whereas, the people of Cuba have established municipal governments deriving their authority from the suffrages of the people given under just and equal laws, and are now ready, in like manner, to proceed to the establishment of a general government which shall assume and exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction and control over the island;

Therefore, it is ordered that a general election be held in the island of Cuba on the third Saturday of September, in the year nineteen hundred, to elect delegates to a Convention to meet in the City of Havana, at twelve o'clock noon on the first Monday of November, in the year nineteen hundred, to frame and adopt a Constitution for the people of Cuba, and, as a part thereof, to provide for and agree with the Government of the United States upon the relations to exist between that Government and the Government of Cuba, and to provide for the election by the people of officers under such Constitution and the transfer of government to the officers so elected."

The announcement of the terms of this call brought out criticism in the United States and protest in Cuba. Political parties refused to participate under such terms; individuals refused to go to the polls; and candidates expressed their determination, in the event of their election, to resign from the Convention, unless the terms were modified by the excision of the specially objectionable point that provision for and agreement with the United States, in the matter of "relations," be embodied in the Constitution, "as a part thereof." Relying upon oral assurances which were given them that this clause would be modified, the Cubans

held their election, and the successful candidates duly assembled in Havana upon the date specified, "the first Monday of November." Lack of space forbids a review here of the terms and conditions of the electoral law, or of the methods employed in the processes of the election. Such a consideration would be interesting and instructive, but it would be useless, inasmuch as the body which assembled in the Marti Theatre in Havana, on November 5, 1900, was, and can only be regarded as, the legally elected and constituted representative of the Cuban people. As a matter of fact, the point whether or not it was representative is decidedly open to discussion. As a matter of law, it is not.

The promise of modification of the conditions expressed in Order No. 301, was faithfully kept. Upon the day of assembly, General Wood read to the delegates that which now stands, under date of November 9, 1900, as Civil Order No. 455. It runs as follows:

"To the Delegates of the Constitutional Convention of Cuba:

GENTLEMEN.—As Military Governor of the island, representing the President of the United States, I call this Convention to order.

It will be your duty, first, to frame and adopt a Constitution for Cuba, and, when that has been done, to formulate what, in your opinion, ought to be the relations between Cuba and the United States.

The Constitution must be adequate to secure a stable, orderly, and free government."

For some reason, this order does not appear to have received wide circulation in the United States. If it did get into circulation it received little attention. When the special issue involved became prominent, namely, that of the separation of the matter of the Constitution from that of mutual relations, and the substitution of an expression of "opinion" in the place of a provision for and agreement with the United States upon the subject of those relations, the Convention was widely denounced in this country for its failure to include in the Constitution that which it was told to leave out. Not only did the official and formal instructions separate the two, but General Wood, after having read these instructions to the assembled Convention, delivered a brief and informal address in which he emphasized the point. A local paper, in its issue of the following morning, reported the incident as follows:

"When Secretary Verona had concluded reading the Spanish translation of the address, General Wood made a few more plain remarks to the delegates. He wanted them to understand that they had been elected to form a Constitution for Cuba. That was their plain duty. The matter of relations which should exist between Cuba and the United States was another matter. He wished them success."

This point is of some importance from the fact that there is every reason for the belief that, owing to a mistaken view of the exact situa-

tion, many Americans assumed that the Cuban Convention was deliberately violating its definite instructions, and became prejudiced against the Cubans as a result of this assumption. It is certain that much unkindly criticism and unfavorable comment appeared in the columns of the daily press and the magazines. This comment and criticism reached Havana, and not a little of it was copied by the local papers as an indication of American sentiment. The effect of this was unwholesome. Merited criticism is not always acceptable. Carping criticism, based upon inadequate information, is quite sure to result in resentment.

From the very beginning of the work of the Convention, there was a tacit, if not definitely expressed, understanding that the United States was to stand wholly aloof from its proceedings. Owing to the practical impossibility of absolutely verifying certain rumors and suspicions which one is obliged to credit without being able to establish them for general acceptance, it is not easy to make any statement respecting the degree of strictness with which this professed policy of non-interference was observed during the earlier days of the sittings. The term "obstructionists" came to the surface when the regular public sessions began; and a fair number of members believed that the so-called obstructionist element was influenced by the military government. A motion to hold night sessions, in addition to the regular afternoon sessions, was introduced, partly for the more rapid despatch of the work of the Convention, and partly for the purpose of forcing all or some of the suspected obstructionists to declare themselves. But no direct interference appeared until the middle of February.

The story of Cuba's Constitution making is generally similar to the story of all deliberative and legislative bodies. It is a story of interesting routine; of work in committee rooms, in private and in public sessions; of the manoeuvring of political parties to secure party advantage or party supremacy; of tiresome discussion and heated debate; of effort to secure the adoption of this plan or that plan, and to prevent the acceptance of this theory or that theory. On February 11, fifteen weeks from the day of the opening session, the Cuban Constitution was completed and accepted in its final form, although it was not signed until February 21. The value and the merit of the instrument are matters of opinion. In criticising it, Americans will do well to remember that it was framed by Cubans for a Cuban Government, and not by Americans for an American Government. It is not a perfect instrument, in all probability; but it should not be forgotten that American State Constitutions have been amended and even newly framed from time to

time, and that America's National Constitution has had the benefit of several amendments, numerous decisions regarding the exact meaning of certain passages, and an endless amount of both mild and forcible criticism. The Cuban Constitution, like all similar documents, is a working basis for a nation, and is capable of modification if and when exigencies may arise. Numerous eminent authorities in the United States have expressed their opinion that with the Cuban Constitution the United States has nothing to do. By the declaration of an American Congress, Cuba "is, and of right ought to be, free and independent." By the declaration of the Supreme Court of the United States, Cuba is a foreign country. Action upon the Constitution of a free and independent foreign country is beyond the scope of American authority.

The Constitution having been duly framed and adopted, in strict accordance with the instructions given, the next step in the sequence of those instructions was the formulation of what, in the "opinion" of the Convention, "ought to be the relations between Cuba and the United States." It was at this point and upon this subject that the present trouble began. Washington was beginning to realize the possible error of General Wood's assurances that the work of the Cuban Convention would require no attention at the hands of Congress during the session then in progress. The month of January had developed, first, intimations that the Cuban Constitution might be up in time for action; then, indications that it would be up; and, soon after, quite distinct assurance of its submission about the middle of February. This was somewhat disconcerting to the Washington plans. It raised for Congressional consideration an unexpected question, for which Congress was not ready. Talk of an extra session began to be heard. No one desired such a session; yet, for a time, it seemed imperative. The talk which was made about it misled the members of the Convention, who, unwisely, relied too much upon that event, and dallied a little with their work. Had they, as they might and should have done, kept up the pace of the month of January, their Constitution might well have been completed and signed by February 10. But time was lost through reliance upon reports which strongly indicated that an extra session would be held for the consideration of Cuban affairs.

The practical completion of the Constitution, on February 11, was followed by the appointment of a central committee to prepare and to submit to the Convention projects concerning the matter of relations. This committee was composed of Señores Diego Tamayo, Gonzalo de Quesada, Juan Gualberto Gomez, Enrique Villuendas, and Manuel Ramon

Silva. Before they had settled down to their work, there came that unwise violation of the policy of non-interference. For some unknown reason, unless, indeed, it was misled by questionable information, our own Government appears to have assumed that the Cubans would draft some form of proposals, and submit the requested "opinion" in terms which would not suit the Washington plan. The few close observers who were in Cuba watching every move and turn of act and sentiment in the Convention had no such idea. It is true that there was division of opinion among the members of the Convention; but there had been division upon many points in the process of framing the Constitution. The only vital points lay in these facts: (1) that, in that Constitution, all matters relating to alien people or to foreign countries were drawn upon broadly liberal lines; and (2) that again and again in the processes of debate the matter of relations to the United States had been touched upon, usually in terms which clearly showed a recognition of Cuba's dependence upon that country in many ways, and which evinced a desire for the closest and most harmonious of connections. There had been expressions which showed a realization of all that America had done for Cuba, and of America's rights and interests in Cuba's affairs. The proper time to consider the Cuban "opinion of what ought to be the relations" would have been when the Cubans had done their work and submitted that opinion. The interference which now occurred was premature, ill-advised, and most unfortunate in its results.

About January 1, there appeared in the local papers two sets of propositions, of which the following is a translation. The first provides:

"I. The Republic of Cuba regards as a necessity for its preservation, in accordance with the spirit of the Monroe Doctrine, establishment of definite relations of friendship and commerce with all other nations; in order to maintain the principles of that doctrine she will proceed in all cases, in peace as well as in war, in common accord with the United States.

II. The Republic of Cuba will place at the disposal of the United States, should the latter so desire, part of the shore of any bay on the North coast and of any two bays on the South coast of Cuba; such territory conceded to be selected by the United States and to be used for establishment of naval and coaling stations, the concessions to be of sufficient area to permit of proper defence and sanitation.

III. The Republic of Cuba will put herself on a war footing whenever the United States shall consider her assistance necessary to defend or protect the independence of the States which constitute the entire American continent.

IV. Amplification of these conditions shall correspond with the foregoing, and dispositions for complying therewith shall be embodied in a special message from the head of the Government of the Republic to the co-legislative bodies."

The other proposition stipulates:

"I. Sent by the people of Cuba, we are freely congregated in conformity with the authorization conferred by the military order to convene.

II. Having agreed upon a political Constitution upon which to found an independent, democratic Republic, we are still without a definite agreement as to what the future relations of Cuba and the United States will be, constitutionally. We, the delegates, not having been given legislative faculties, cannot arrange the basis of future relations, such attributes pertaining entirely to the co-legislative bodies.

III. Nevertheless, if the Washington Government, whose discretion and knowledge we recognize, should deem it necessary, we are willing to discuss, agree upon, and present a basis for arrangement of our mutual relations.

IV. Finally: The aspirations of the Convention are merely to consolidate the situation of the country, whose welfare demands her early reconstruction, that all of her energies may be directed toward supporting the policy of the great Republic, to which she is bound by the indestructible ties of gratitude — a policy based upon the unequivocal preservation of liberty and independence throughout the American continent."

Neither of these called out any special enthusiasm or any special criticism. About February 1, *La Nacion* published the following proposals, which were copied and not unfavorably commented upon by other journals:

"That the Republic, for a period of two years after the establishment of independence, will conduct foreign affairs through the United States, will make no treaty with any other nation prejudicial to the United States, and will accept no compromise which might give rise to the occupation of the island or to intervention in its customs.

That the United States, for a period of two years after the establishment of independence, may occupy forts in Cuba, provided the Cuban flag flies with the American.

That Cuba will lease to the United States two coaling stations, and will give no commercial advantages to any other nation which are not given to the United States.

That none of these concessions or promises is to be taken to imply any cessation of the sovereignty of Cuba or any lessening of her complete independence."

At about the same time two long letters appeared in local papers. They bore the signatures of Generals Rius Rivera and José Alemán, both of the ultra-radical party. These, while manifesting no spirit of hostility to the United States, stood upon the issue of Cuba's absolute independence, and argued for an unabridged sovereignty, unabridged as well by the United States as by other powers. Both were received with not a little hostile criticism, as failing to reflect either popular sentiment or the sentiment of the Convention, of which body both gentlemen were members. Much that came to me in private conversation, within and outside the Convention circle, led me to a fixed belief that, without some undue interference or unexpected change of opinion, the Convention would adopt an "opinion" based upon the above project, quoted from *La Nacion*. It might have broadened those lines or it might have narrowed them; but I firmly believe that the main points now at issue

would have been conceded, and would have formed at least a basis for further and wholly friendly negotiations. But the interference came, without need and without warrant. It came in a fashion which gave deep offence to a sensitive people; which sacrificed an existing cordiality; and which led to the almost unanimous adoption of an "opinion" which practically places the United States, politically, on a basis with all other nations.

The story of this interference is too long for rehearsal in detail here, yet in it there lies the key to the present situation. It will be remembered that the United States was practically committed to a policy of non-interference in the proceedings of the Convention. For February 15, General Wood had planned an alligator-hunting trip. On the morning of that day an official communication from Washington reached the Palace. It contained a brief outline of President McKinley's idea of Cuban "relations," submitted as a "hint" for the guidance of the Convention. Instead of delaying his excursion or officially submitting the President's communication through its proper channels to the Convention, the Military Governor requested, or summoned, at very brief notice, the President of the Convention and the Relations Committee to accompany him, for thirty miles of railway, upon a part of his trip, to receive that which he had to give them. This may have been democracy; but the Cubans, not without warrant under the circumstances, took it as a courtesy. They rode the thirty miles, ate a poorer dinner than they would have had at home, and returned at midnight, hurt and offended, to talk about the manner in which suggestions, which they neither wanted nor needed, had been "pitched at" them. They had been assured of freedom of action, and had manifested no disposition to act hastily or foolishly; but here was a "hint," offensively conveyed, that freedom of action meant only freedom of action within certain limitations. The dormant suspicions concerning American good faith were awakened, and the old distrust was revived.

The smart of the first blow still lingered when a second was applied. On February 21, the Military Governor, having a second official communication to make upon the subject of relations, addressed it directly to "Dr. Diego Tamayo, *presidente de comision de relaciones*." This document contained a "suggestion" from the American President of what he thought the Cubans ought to think the relations between the countries ought to be. In its real effect, it was a request that Cuba should enable the administration to violate legally the Joint Resolution of April, 1898, by accepting, approving, and officially endorsing her resignation of the "free-

dom and independence," the right to "government and control," pledged to her in that Resolution. To such a renunciation of that independence which has been the dream and the hope of thousands of Cubans, this document, conveyed semi-privately, "suggested" that the Convention should set its hand and seal. Smarting under these two blows, the Convention, five days later, submitted its own proposals, which were widely at variance in their spirit from either the "hint" or the "suggestion," as well as from that tentative Cuban proposition which, but a few days before, presented fair promise of adoption.

The inclusion of the correspondence and of the documents connected with these proceedings, all of them interesting and some of them important, would involve the production of a volume on this particular incident in Cuban history. This hasty outline has now brought us to the time when the Convention adopted that "opinion" which it had been instructed, by the Military Governor acting for the President of the United States, to "formulate." This was done at two o'clock on the morning of February 27.

The terms of the Platt amendment had already been made public, and copies had been received in Havana. It is wholly probable that some day the American people will regard the passage of that amendment as a hasty and ill-considered act. It is no credit to America that the honor of a great nation and the independence of a small one should be made a subject of political barter in an American Congress. It is no credit to American legislation that after but two hours of debate a law should have been passed to effect that which even the slightest knowledge of the subject would have clearly pointed out as a subject of negotiation and not of legislation. The tangle in Cuba is of American, and not of Cuban, manufacture. The Cubans are no demigods, but they have enough manhood to resent such treatment as has been accorded them.

Had we treated the Cubans as one nation should treat another, particularly as a great and powerful nation should treat a weak and struggling people whom it has befriended and helped, the Cuban Convention would have granted all that could have been asked, and in all probability would have granted it without the asking, had due time been given them to do so before we made peremptory demands upon them. Independence is still with those who give voluntarily, though they give all that which they possess and transfer all right of independent action. To yield territory or to delegate political rights to a stronger power, under coercion in any form, under restraint in any particular, is to become dependent, subject. It is beyond question that the attitude of the authori-

ties of the United States has tended to solidify Cuban sentiment. Men who heretofore have stood opposed to the Convention and its purposes are to-day supporting it, believing that their country has suffered a wrong at the hands of its professed benefactors. All will yet be brought to a harmonious and mutually satisfactory conclusion, though months may elapse and many changes arise before that day shall come. But the experience of the opening weeks of the new century will fade but slowly from the Cuban mind. From that experience, and from much that preceded it, the Cuban has learned to distrust the good faith of the American Government.

In closing, I submit a Cuban translation of a Cuban editorial in a Cuban paper. *La Patria* of March 19 thus presents its case:

"Everybody in Cuba regrets it most deeply; but it is incumbent upon us to state very emphatically, that this state of affairs has been brought about exclusively by the United States Government, who attempted to exert pressure upon and coerce the Constitutional Convention into accepting the terms which the United States wanted the Cubans to accept, at the very moment that the Convention was discussing the relations which should exist between the future Government of Cuba and the United States. And, not satisfied with this, in a law, whose object was simply to provide for appropriations, the United States Government suddenly introduces a clause, which attempts to settle, in a precipitate and brutal manner, a question which demands great tact, exquisite prudence, and discretion, in order so to present it that it shall not estrange and divide two nations that should live in the closest harmony and cordiality."

ALBERT G. ROBINSON.

RUSSIAN NIHILISM OF TO-DAY.

AT an entertainment of a society of Russian revolutionists which I recently attended, on the east side of New York, the singing was all done in subdued voices. When I asked why they did not sing louder, one of the members explained that he and his companions, who were all fresh from their birthplace, had learned their revolutionary airs at the gatherings of secret organizations. "We are accustomed to sing and to conduct our meetings all but in whispers," he said, "because this is the way we do these things at home, where one has gendarmes and spies to guard against."

The larger Russian cities, particularly the university towns and centres of industry, swarm with political detectives; yet the revolutionists manage to print "underground" papers, to hold mass-meetings, and to celebrate the several holidays in the calendar of international socialism. Like the early Christians, or the Spanish Jews in the days of the Inquisition, the Nihilists "worship" in forests and other hiding-places. One of the young men present at the entertainment told how he and his friends had observed the First of May in a pine wood on the outskirts of his native town.

"We marched up and down a clearing some fifty yards in length, stepping softly, almost on tiptoe, and singing revolutionary songs under breath. We had red handkerchiefs with us, too, which we tied to our canes, so as to make them do duty for red flags—the symbol of fraternity. Here it sounds funny, but in Russia, where those who take part in a demonstration of this kind lay themselves open to imprisonment and exile, these things are done in dead earnest. As we marched stealthily along and muttered our socialist songs, our thoughts were in Paris, Brussels, London, or New York, where our brother socialists were at that moment celebrating the same festival openly, without having to fear arrest for doing so. The comparison between our condition and theirs lent special gravity to our poor parade. There was something extremely melancholy in the spectacle, and many of us swore in our hearts to devote our lives to the cause of Russian freedom."

During the few years when "terroristic" Nihilism was at its height, when the revolutionary party was mining railroad tracks over which the Czar was expected to pass, these champions of liberty scarcely managed to publish two "underground" papers. Now the number of revo-

lutionary organs, more or less regularly brought out "under the very nose of the gendarmes," is twelve. It is admitted, however, that those who take part in the printing or circulating of these papers do not run the risks which the same sort of work involved in former days. Time was when persons arrested in a secret printing-office were sentenced to long terms of hard labor in the Siberian mines. This, as a rule, actually meant death, within a year or two, from consumption, scurvy, or insanity, in a damp, isolated dungeon in the fortress of Peter and Paul or of Schlüsselburg. The men and women, therefore, who volunteered to set type in the revolutionary printing-establishments of fifteen or twenty years ago took their lives in their hands. Having nothing to lose, they were armed, and when raided by the gendarmes they defended themselves desperately. Thus, when the police had discovered the house where the organ of the terrorists was printed, shortly after the assassination of Alexander II, the firing on both sides lasted about an hour and a half. The case is different with the Nihilists who are connected with the underground Russian press of to-day. The average punishment for an offence of this kind is now about eight years of "free exile" in Siberia; and as there is scarcely a village in Asiatic Russia that has not from twenty to thirty "politicals" among its inhabitants, life in banishment is not half so hard to bear as it used to be. As a consequence, the raiding of a secret newspaper office is never accompanied by bloodshed now; and no sooner does one office fall into the hands of the enemy than another springs up in the same city.

Besides the papers which are printed by the Nihilists at home, they import revolutionary pamphlets from Switzerland and England. These are smuggled across the frontier by a well-organized group of contrabandists, all members of the revolutionary party. The monthly average of pamphlets and tracts reaching Russia by these channels is 50,000. Their distribution is entrusted to an army of workers who go from town to town under various guises, delivering the "goods" in the various "conspiracy houses."

To be sure, many a smuggler or carrier is caught by the political police; but the prisons are so full of Nihilists that instead of keeping them three or four years in preliminary confinement, as the system was formerly, the Government is forced to dispose of their cases with comparative speed, in order to make room for new prisoners. The jails in several cities are so overcrowded that important offenders have often to be transferred to a ramshackle village prison, from which some of them find it easy to escape.

During the last year or two, the revolutionary societies have so grown in boldness that, in several instances, the First of May, or the anniversary of the Paris Commune of 1871, was celebrated by open processions through the streets; whereupon, in some cases, the crowd was so large that the police dared not interfere. A letter, for example, in the last number of a revolutionary paper published in Kieff thus describes the funeral of a socialist named Visotzki, who died in Byelostok:

"About 3,000 working people followed the hearse, and, as we were passing the jail, we began to sing revolutionary songs, to let our comrades within the gloomy building know that the cause for which they are suffering is alive. The coffin was inscribed with the words: 'From socialists to a champion of liberty.' For the first time in the history of our town there appeared in its streets red flags emblazoned with revolutionary mottoes. From the crowds on the sidewalks came shouts of 'Down with despotism!' and 'Long live liberty!' . . . The police dared make only two arrests. . . ."

A similar demonstration is reported from Moscow, where the paraders smashed the windows of the Governor-General, Grand Duke Sergius. Thousands of educated subjects are signing a monster petition asking the Crown for a constitution. All this would have been impossible under the two previous administrations; and the old Nihilists, who hear of these things in their isolated cells in the fortresses, unanimously declare the present movement to be a new chapter in the history of Russian socialism. It seems plain that the city population of the empire has been educated up to a higher sense of civic self-respect; and there are a thousand straws which show that the political wind of Russia blows in the direction of more liberal institutions. Events which have grown out of the recent disturbances in St. Petersburg and Kieff confirm the general opinion that the iron-handed régime of former years, when seventeen-year-old boys were hanged for posting up a revolutionary proclamation, has been abandoned.

While among the inmates of the Siberian prisons there are men who are serving a life sentence for complicity in an unsuccessful attempt upon the life of some inferior official, twenty or twenty-five years ago, Peter Karpovitch, the college student who recently killed Bogolyepoff, the Minister of Public Instruction, was sentenced to twenty years' imprisonment only. Logovski, the statistician who shot at Pobyedonostzeff, the actual ruler of Russia, was sent to the mines for six years; whereas Molodetzki, who fired at Loris-Melikoff, the *alter ego* of Alexander II, was hanged forty-eight hours after the attempt.

It cannot be said that the present administration is guided in its domestic policy by a more humane spirit than were the ancestors of

Nicholas II; for, indeed, the laws are the same, and Pobyedonostzeff, "the Torquemada of Russia," has an even tighter hold upon the present Czar than he had upon his father. Barring exceptional cases in which the ingrained brutality of the officials crops out in the full force of its Asiatic fury, the authorities simply lack the courage to employ the drastic measures which were in vogue about a decade ago. A striking illustration of the changed mood of the higher bureaucracy is offered by the fate of the recent decree to punish certain college students by forcibly drafting them into the army. As a result of the storm of protestations which the matter called forth, this decree has been put into abeyance; and this, too, after Bogolyepoff, the author of the measure, had been killed by a revolutionist. What a contrast between this state of things and that which prevailed under Alexander III, when the mere signing of a memoir protesting against the abuses of certain officials was punished by exile! Pobyedonostzeff is the same, but the public has gained in dignity.

As a consequence, the "underground terror" which was forced on the old-time Nihilists by the "gendarmerie terror" of the Government has been discarded. The party of "The Will of the People," whose agents assassinated Alexander II and a score of obnoxious governors, public prosecutors, gendarme officers, and political spies, is practically a thing of the past. The last number of its organ was issued in 1886. About a year later, on the morning of March 13, 1887, the anniversary of the killing of Alexander II, three educated young men stood on Great Sea Street, St. Petersburg, waiting for Alexander III, each with a dynamite bomb under his coat. They had been betrayed, and now they were arrested before the Emperor came in sight. This was the closing event in the brief, but eventful, history of the *Narodovoltzi* (Members of "The Will of the People").

Revolutionary Russia of to-day traces its origin to the political crusades of the seventies and eighties; but it owes its present vitality to a new social factor, and is developing along new lines. It is still an "underground" movement, of course, and as such it necessarily retains many of the traits which characterized the struggle between the plucky *Narodovoltzi* and the Government; but it radically differs from the "circles" of those days in point of methods, as well as in the character and extent of its main field of action.

The killing of the Russian Minister of Public Instruction and the attempt upon the life of the Procurator of the Holy Synod did not form part of an organized movement. Karpovitch was a member of a secret

organization in whose programme acts of violence, as a system, had no room. He was a peaceful educator of the masses, a social-democrat of the German type, a kind-hearted dreamer absorbed in visions of a better world. In a speech which he delivered at his trial he portrayed the retrogressive spirit which Bogolyepoff had introduced in the schools and colleges. When the order was issued condemning university students to penal servitude in the army, he made up his mind to call attention to Bogolyepoff as the embodiment of despotism. "I was not anxious to kill him; I merely wanted to open the eyes of the people," he said.

As to Logovski, he is an ardent follower of Tolstoy, a believer in the doctrine of non-resistance. In his speech before his judges, he dwelt, by way of explaining the contradiction between his creed and the act for which he was on trial, upon his frenzy of indignation at hearing of the order to excommunicate the great novelist. He held Pobyedonostzeff, he said, responsible for the slavery and the woes of the Russian people. He sincerely believed that by removing him he would remove one of the chief causes of the evil.

Unlike the *Narodovoltzi*, who usually proclaimed themselves agents of the terroristic executive committee, and spoke of their mines and bombs as part of a complex scheme to demoralize the Government, by destroying the more obnoxious dignitaries of state, the two men referred to took upon themselves all responsibility for what they had done.

The most significant feature of the recent disturbances, that which furnishes a clew to the entire political situation in the dominions of the Czar, is the participation of large numbers of workingmen in the demonstrations suppressed by the authorities. Despatches from St. Petersburg speak of a "bloody encounter between Cossacks and factory hands," as a result of student riots. The revolutionary press reports open anti-Government demonstrations of secret trade unions. The meaning of it all is that labor forms the rank and file of the revolutionary party of to-day. This is a new and significant departure in the history of Russia's struggle for liberty.

Perhaps the best explanation of the character and meaning of the growing unrest is to be found in a report submitted to the Czar by Trepoff, chief of the political police of Moscow. The document is marked "secret." This, however, did not prevent a copy of it from falling into the hands of the Nihilists, who published it in the "Cause of Labor," a little periodical printed by their agents in Geneva, Switzerland.

"Your Imperial Majesty!" reads the report. "The past history of the revolutionary movement has made it clear that the unaided forces drawn from the intelli-

gent classes are unable to carry on a struggle with the Government, even though the educated revolutionists have recourse to explosives. Bearing this in mind, the anti-Government groups heartily applaud the new Social-Democratic agitation, hoping, as they do, to win the laboring masses for their seditious undertakings, and thus to rally a force so large that the authorities will have to take it seriously. Russian revolutionists hastily abandoned their old standards in order to join the new movement. Experience has led them to devote themselves to an indefatigable propaganda among working men along the lines of their daily needs and demands."

The report goes on to draw a parallel between the methods of the earlier Nihilists, whose appeal was lost upon the illiterate masses, and the tactics of the new movement, which addresses itself to the daily interests of the wage workers, taking advantage of every friction between capital and labor:

"The new policy has brought the revolutionists encouraging results. Great labor strikes have come into being which have ended in a way satisfactory to the working people. . . . These triumphs of labor have a dangerous political effect in that they form an elementary school for the revolutionary education of the working people."

As a remedy, the chief of the political police begs the Czar to take the labor question into his own hands:

"The present moment is such a troublous one, the activity of our revolutionists is so intense, that the struggle with this evil calls for the harmonious co-operation of the various government departments."

The real source of the danger to Russian absolutism lies in the industrial growth of the country. While in some instances a strike may be the result of the agitator's persuasion, an epidemic of economic conflicts can scarcely be of such an artificial origin. The occurrences to which the above report alludes are the inevitable upshot of the new industrial conditions. But while industrially Russia is falling into line with the more advanced countries, her political complexion remains unchanged. Such a discrepancy between the economics and the politics of a country cannot last long. It was this kind of discrepancy which in 1848 gave rise to revolutions in France, Germany, and Austria, and to important movements in England.

Trade unions, meetings, and the publication of papers devoted to the interests of labor are strictly forbidden in Russia. To strike means to rebel against the Government. As a consequence, all labor organizations are secret societies, and their revolutionary character is implied by the very nature of their existence. The working people who take part in strikes accuse the Government of siding with their employers. Recently, after some strikers had been shot down by soldiers, the regiment which had taken part in the affair received the personal thanks of the Czar. The story was published in the revolutionary papers; and the result was

that the monarch, whom the masses are wont to revere as their "little father," was cursed as an enemy of the people.

As the workingmen clamor for free speech and the right of assemblage, they form the main force in the struggle for constitutional reform. Free speech and the right to hold meetings are just the things the educated classes are coveting. Hence the bond between the two elements of the population; hence the presence of refined men and women side by side with factory proletarians in the recent student riots. Count Tolstoy is not a social-democrat, but the socialist workingmen of Russia have learned, in their secret trade unions, to respect the martyrs of human progress.

Free speech and the right of assemblage were the two principal demands of the *Narodovoltzi* in the letter which they sent to Alexander III after assassinating his father:

"Make it possible for us to educate and uplift the common people, as we started to do in the seventies; grant the country the privileges which every civilized land in the world enjoys; do not bury men and women alive for trying to teach a peasant to read and to think; grant this and we will be glad to lay down our weapons."

Such, in substance, was what the terrorists wrote to the Czar; and Kibalchitch, the man who invented the fatal bomb, said at his trial that if it had not been for the bloodthirsty policy of the Government, he would have devoted himself to the invention not of a machine of destruction, but of something which might facilitate the work of the poor farmer.

These men, who knew how to penetrate into the Winter Palace and to blow up the Czar's dining hall, were comparatively few in number. The party of "The Will of the People" was made up of fifty or seventy-five fearless and able leaders, backed by a few thousand of more or less active propagandists. Almost all of them belonged to the educated classes, and some of their number belonged to the best families in the country. Thus, Sophia Perovskaya, the young woman who played the mistress of the house at the place near Moscow from which an imperial train was blown up by means of an elaborate mine, in 1879, and who gave the signal to fire the bomb which killed Alexander II two years later, was the daughter of a former Governor of St. Petersburg, and a niece of a cabinet minister. True, an active agitation among the workingmen was started by the leading terrorists; and Timothei Michailoff, one of Sophia Perovskaya's co-defendants, a plain workingman himself, explained at the trial that the unfriendly attitude of the Government toward labor was the main cause which drove him into the ranks of the revolutionists. Men like Michailoff were exceptional cases, however. The number of working-people among the *Narodovoltzi* was very small.

The Nihilistic movement of those days, notwithstanding the noise it made throughout the world, was a head without a body. This accounts for its failure. The Nihilism of to-day has a robust and growing body — the working class; and, although its existence is not proclaimed by the explosion of bombs or mines, the enemies of free institutions watch its movements with greater anxiety than they did the indomitable terrorists.

The term Nihilism, which was once used to denote a certain short-lived school of thought, is seldom applied to the Russian revolutionists in their own country. The propagandists of the seventies, when men and women of education put on peasant garb and went to live the lives of the common people, were known as *narodniki* (peasantists); the terrorists called themselves "Radicals"; while the people connected with the present movement insist upon being called, and are generally referred to as, "Social-Democrats"—a name borrowed from the socialist parties of Western Europe and America, whose teachings form the underlying principle of the Russian revolutionary programme. Like the German followers of Karl Marx, for example, they are opposed to anarchism, in theory as well as in practice. How they look upon the killing of officials or spies is indicated in an editorial in the last issue of their organ, "The Spark." Speaking of Subatoff, the head of political detectives, and of a factory spy who was recently killed in Warsaw, this paper says:

"The terroristic crusade upon spies is the inevitable result of the spy system itself. As long as the working people are compelled to conduct their struggle underground; as long as they are deprived of the right to unite and to defend their interests in open field; as long as each step taken by the champion of justice involves imprisonment or exile; just so long will it be impossible to expect the discontinuance of this sort of terrorism. But the Social-Democracy cannot be carried away by such measures as the killing of spies. Our great hope is for a movement of the whole working class. *Acts of violence can only be the work of individuals, and are of no advantage to a cause which makes for the emancipation of the whole working class.* . . . We cannot be held responsible for the bloody revenge wreaked by some of our comrades upon the Czar's spies; although, on the other hand, we cannot look upon them as criminals, either. To us they are the victims of a despicable order of things, and all our sympathy belongs to those who stake their lives for that which, in their judgment, is beneficial to the cause."

To judge from certain rumors Subatoff's life is in danger. His predecessor, Colonel Sudeikin, carried confusion into the revolutionary organizations by prevailing upon some of the weaker men in their ranks to become spies. One of these, an army officer named Degayeff, a man high in the counsels of the terrorists, betrayed some of the most important members of the party, including Madame Viera Figner, a noble-

woman of uncommon beauty and ability, who had been connected with several of the plots upon the life of the Czar, and who is still languishing in one of the casemates of Schlüsselburg. Subsequently, Degayeff became repentant, and offered to atone for his treachery by killing Sudeikin. The offer was accepted on condition that, immediately after assassinating the shrewd detective, Degayeff should leave Russia. The terms of the agreement were fulfilled. Sudeikin was murdered, and Degayeff made his way to the United States. Subatoff has adopted Sudeikin's methods, so the revolutionists predict that he will meet with the same fate.

An interesting feature of the situation is the free rein given to writers with avowed Marxian views on economic and historical questions. While the mildest criticism of the Government's policy is punished by the suspension of the paper printing such strictures, the magazines of St. Petersburg and Moscow and some of the newspapers have, during the last few years, been publishing articles of an avowedly socialistic nature. It is a curious fact that in none of the free countries do the doctrines of Karl Marx receive so liberal a share of attention on the part of the cultured classes as they do in the censor-ridden land of the Czar. The leading authority of the Russian Marxists is George Plekhanoff, formerly the editor of one of the underground papers, and a guiding spirit in the revolutionary "circles" of twenty years ago. He is the actual head of the new movement; and, although he lives in Switzerland, his books, printed under various pseudonyms, have a large circulation in Russia.

To be sure, these books and magazine articles are of a purely theoretical nature, and are looked upon by the Government as innocent academic sport; but they help to leaven the educated part of the population with social-democratic sentiment, and materially aid the new crusade. That sympathy with scientific socialism is "all the rage" just now is shown by the frequency with which the educated Marxist, as a social type, occurs in the recent Russian novels of the better class.

It is scarcely conceivable that the Government is blind to all this. If it continues to allow the publication of the treatises in question — a thing which would have been utterly impossible about ten years ago — the explanation is to be sought in the same political awakening of the urban population which accounts for the comparative leniency which the Government has shown in its treatment of political offenders.

Now and then some high official who fails to realize the spirit of the time will call into play measures which remind one of the reign of

Alexander II or III; but he soon finds out his mistake. The recent massacre of students and working people in front of the Kasan Cathedral, St. Petersburg, is a case in point. Private letters of eye-witnesses describe how Cossacks, intoxicated by a lust of blood, similar to that which secured for their "brothers in whips" unenviable fame in Manchuria, "knocked the heads of student-girls against the walls of the church, slashing their faces with their *nagaikas* (whips of braided leather with lumps of lead at the end of them), trampling upon them. . . . Several men and women who saw their relatives and friends thus butchered went insane on the spot." The storm of open indignation which this slaughter of innocent people aroused throughout the land did not, however, fall upon deaf ears. The chief of police was immediately replaced by a less brutal officer; and some of the measures which had called forth the ill-fated demonstration were practically repealed.

The Government has always treated the college students as enemies of the existing order of things; but never did the public take such a bold interest in such matters as it did in the case here referred to. The universities are regarded by the authorities as so many schools of revolution. The Government of the Czar is a government of the tenth century, while the colleges represent European culture of the twentieth; so the conservative powers behind the throne look upon the latter as institutions inimical to the interests of the Crown. As a consequence, conflicts between college boys and the police are quite a common occurrence in Russia. In 1879 the students of the University of Kharkoff were brutally attacked by a detachment of Cossacks acting under orders from Prince Kropotkin, the Governor of the province, a cousin of the well-known scientist and humanitarian who has just completed a lecturing tour in this country. The revolutionists condemned the Governor to death. The fact that his relative was one of the heroes of "underground Russia" did not save him. He was shot dead by a man named Goldenburg, on his way from the theatre. Similar conflicts have taken place almost annually. In a majority of instances the trouble originates in some students getting up a petition asking for some changes in the management of the college; whereupon the signers of the document are usually expelled from the university, or even exiled to Siberia. The sending of educated young men to the army by way of punishment is quite an unusual measure. Under Russian conditions it amounts to hard labor in a penal institution, and has not been practised since the stern days of Nicholas II.

ABRAHAM CAHAN.

THE PLACE OF THE SENATE IN OUR GOVERNMENT.

ACCORDING to a tradition, more or less authenticated, it was George Washington who remarked that the Senate of the United States was the saucer into which the hot tea of the House of Representatives was poured to cool. Some idea of this kind was certainly in the minds of the framers of the Constitution. Madison suggested that the Senate ought to be so constituted as to protect the opulent minority against the changing, irresponsible, and turbulent majority. Hamilton, who did not believe that the voice of the people was the voice of God, would have had Senators appointed for life. More than one of the Constitution-makers referred to the Senate as the Privy Council of the President; and, almost without exception, they regarded it as the brake of conservatism upon the wheels of national legislation. They found its model in the confederation of Grecian States, "where each city, however different in wealth, strength, or other circumstances, had the same number of deputies and an equal voice in everything that related to the concerns of Greece." The States of the United Netherlands, the Confederated Cantons of Switzerland, and, in some degree at least, the British House of Lords were all replete with suggestion for the constructive statesmen who created the American Senate. And yet, while this is true, the fact remains, as Fisher points out in his "Evolution of the Constitution," that the Senate is really the outgrowth of our own experience. It is the gradual development from the Governor's Council of colonial times. As early as 1769 the members of the Council of Massachusetts were chosen to represent certain localities or great districts, a function still preserved in the representation of each State by two Senators, irrespective of area, wealth, or population.

Within the last few years the Senate of the United States has assumed so dominant a part in national legislation that it becomes interesting and instructive to consider how far the original idea of its establishment has been maintained in the evolution of our government. Washington's quaint and expressive phrase still has some meaning and significance. The Senate is still the conservative branch of the Congress. Its members, elected for six years by State Legislatures, decide national

questions with minds less perturbed by fear of popular clamor than the Representatives, whose reelection, after a brief term of two years, is dependent upon the suffrage of a proverbially fickle public. The Senatorial view is of a wider horizon. It is less subservient to prevailing sentiment, but, it is worth while to note, the register of its judgment has generally been accurate.

Take, for instance, the famous struggle over the so-called Force Bill, a measure passed by a partisan House of Representatives in the first flush of political victory. The contest waged by a skilfully led and determined minority in the Senate resulted in the defeat of the proposed law. The wisdom of that outcome will not, I take it, be seriously questioned to-day. The enactment of the Force Bill would have solidified the South politically, and would have retarded for several decades the material development which has blessed that section. The pouring and cooling process which resulted in its defeat was undoubtedly for the country's good.

Not content, however, with merely refusing to cooperate with the House in the enactment of proposed legislation, or with revising and editing, so to speak, the bills which come to it from the lower body, the Senate of the United States has been responsible, in late years, for numerous measures of great importance. The Wilson Tariff Bill, as framed in the House of Representatives, was discarded by the Senate and a new measure substituted; the latter being accepted by the House with scarcely a whisper of opposition. Identically the same experience befell the resolutions passed by the House declaring that Spain's rule in Cuba was intolerable and not to be endured; while, still more recently, we have seen the Senate originate two of the most important measures ever enacted by Congress — the amendments to the Army Appropriation Bill, one of which bestowed upon the President absolute authority to govern the Philippines, while the other outlined the conditions precedent to the withdrawal of the American troops from Cuba. These amendments, fraught with consequences of the most far-reaching character, were adopted bodily by the House of Representatives after the briefest possible consideration. From the moment that the Senate engrafted these amendments upon the Army Bill, it was a foregone conclusion that the House would swallow them without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t."

It must not be supposed that the Representatives themselves are either ignorant of or indifferent to this condition of affairs. On the contrary, one of the most emphatic, not to say passionate, speeches in the closing hours of the last Congress was a protest by Representative Cannon, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, against the

arrogance of the Senate in assuming to dictate to the House in the matter of legislation. And yet the House is, in itself, largely responsible for the very situation against which it rebels. When under Mr. Reed rules were enacted which made the Speaker of the House the autocrat of Congress the decadence of the House began. The members, individually and collectively, surrendered themselves into the keeping of one man, who wields a despotism as complete as that of the proverbial Czar. It is the Speaker who appoints the committees, arranging their personnel so as to secure harmony with his own views; it is the Speaker who, as the deciding member of the Committee on Rules, determines whether the House shall or shall not consider certain measures; and, finally, it is the Speaker to whom each Representative must appeal for recognition upon the floor of the House. The individual member, unless he be the favored appointee to some prominent committee chairmanship, is rarely a factor in the proceedings of the House. The concentration of power in the Speaker's hands has practically destroyed all personality. Indignant constituencies have sent back to private life for apparent inefficiency members who were never accorded an opportunity to prove their worth. Their political existence has been crushed out beneath the Juggernaut of despotic rules. The Washington correspondents, who are trained to observe the trend of national events, fully realize the change which has come over the House. There was a time, years ago, when every newspaper representative in the National Capital appreciated the necessity of acquainting himself with the temper of the House upon every important proposition. To-day the labor is unnecessary. If the correspondent knows the attitude of the Speaker the problem is at once solved.

It is worth while to understand this situation thoroughly, because, it seems to me, it explains the loss of prestige which the House has sustained and the importance which the Senate has assumed. In the Senate the individual is supreme. Any Senator may address the presiding officer and secure recognition at any time when the floor is not occupied by a colleague. He can offer a resolution upon any subject, and, through admirable rules, can place the Senate upon record as to its disposition. If the majority of the Senate desires to send the resolution to some committee crypt, where it shall remain buried until the campaign, for instance, is safely over, the reference is secured only after a yea-and-nay vote. If the resolution goes upon the calendar, any Senator can at any time move that the Senate proceed to its consideration—a question which must be determined without debate. This again places the Senate

upon record, and is a proceeding absolutely unknown in the House. Thus, in the closing hours of the last Congress, Senator Jones, of Arkansas, the leader of the Democratic minority, proved a thorn in the side of the Republican party by demanding consideration of his resolution discharging the Committee on the Judiciary from further consideration of the Anti-Trust Bill. The effort was not successful, the Republican majority voting solidly in the negative; but Senator Jones had placed the responsibility where it belonged. Almost every day the record is made up in the Senate upon some test question, because the right of the individual is not abridged or restricted.

This preëminence of the individual in the Senate of the United States goes to a remarkable and much-criticised extent. As long as any Senator desires to speak upon any bill under consideration, just so long must hearing be accorded and a vote postponed. This is what is popularly known as unlimited debate. It is the one thing which makes the Senate absolutely unique in legislative bodies. Only recently the River and Harbor Appropriation Bill failed to reach a final vote, because a Senator occupied the floor during the last thirteen hours of the session, ostensibly criticising the measure, but, in reality, talking against time, with the knowledge that when the hands of the clock reached the hour of noon, Congress would expire by limitation, and the bill would die. This performance, extremely irritating to Senators who were interested in the generous appropriations of the bill, has led to a renewal of previous efforts to amend the rules of the Senate, so as to provide for closure, under certain conditions.

These endeavors have failed in the past, and there is no reason to anticipate success in the future. They ought to fail. Under no circumstances ought there to be limitation of debate in the Senate of the United States. It is the only forum where great and grave public questions can be thoroughly and exhaustively discussed. This high position, once held by the House, has been abdicated by that body. We have seen a bill which proposed a complete revision of the tariff, considered in the House for a few days and then passed, when only a score of pages, out of two or three hundred, had received attention. Crude, ill-digested, and lacking all sense of proportion, the measure has been hastily sent to the Senate, with all its imperfections upon its head. Provisions which were of questionable propriety escaped criticism, because they were buried in the pages which were not reached; and, for the same reason, important amendments, upon which the House was anxious to vote, remained unoffered upon the members' desks.

Very different was the course pursued in the Senate, where a rule arbitrarily fixing a day and an hour when a vote must be taken is a thing unknown. Conscious that it could not be hampered, the minority at once prepared to assert itself. It proceeded deliberately to question the Chairman of the Finance Committee as to the reasons which influenced the figures of each schedule, and the answer was necessarily forthcoming. If the reply was not satisfactory or convincing, there was a possibility that the error might be remedied; or, if no alteration was allowed by the majority, the explanation and the action went upon the record, to be read and judged by all men. In the case of the McKinley Bill the Democrats were the inquisitors; while, when the Wilson tariff measure was under consideration, the Republicans assumed the offensive. In both instances several weeks were occupied in the discussion — a period during which there was much criticism of the deliberation of the Senate. The result, however, in each case, proved the wisdom of delay, for the proposed law was vastly improved before its final enactment. The tariff measures which bear the names of McKinley, Wilson, and Dingley, were largely framed in the Senate, while the same is true of the law recently passed to reduce the taxation imposed during the war with Spain.

The value of unlimited debate in the Senate has been so completely established in innumerable instances that it hardly seems worth while to continue an argument in its favor. On the other hand, it will be urged, and with truth, that many measures have been prevented from reaching a final vote because their opponents have talked them to death. It is equally true, however, that no measure ever failed of enactment which had behind it a persistent, earnest majority, supported by public opinion. The defeat of the Force Bill is often cited as a thwarting of the will of the majority of the Senate; but the fact is that, during the long struggle over that measure, the minority became a majority, and the Force Bill was finally displaced by a proposition looking to the free coinage of silver. In the last Congress the Ship Subsidy Bill failed to reach a vote; but there never was, at any time, a solid Republican support for that measure. Some Republican Senators openly opposed it; others gave it only a half-hearted assistance; and many others encouraged the Democrats who planned and executed the campaign of debate. The discussion exposed many of the inequalities, injustices, and iniquities of the measure; so that when the subject is considered at the next session of Congress a more satisfactory bill will be enacted.

And this brings to mind another fact. All the great issues of recent political campaigns have been formulated through Senatorial debates.

This is especially true of the silver question, which leaped into national prominence through the three-months' struggle over the repeal of the Sherman Silver-Purchasing Law. In those three months the financial problem was debated as it never had been, and never could be, in the House; and it is worth while emphasizing the fact that if the bill had been brought to a vote immediately after being reported to the Senate, it would have been defeated. The prolongation of the debate secured the majority necessary for its passage. In the Senate, and in the Senate alone, has the Philippine question received that thoroughness of examination to which it is entitled; and the same might be said of every other important issue before the country.

The power of the individual is still further demonstrated in the Senate of the United States through the fact that nearly all minor legislation is enacted by unanimous consent; the objection of a single Senator being generally fatal to the passage of any bill. This is a tremendous power to lodge in an individual even though he be a Senator of the United States; but it is to the credit of the members of the Senate that the privilege is rarely, if ever, abused. Objections are, of course, not infrequent; but when they are met by amendments or satisfactory explanations, they are almost invariably withdrawn. In the closing days of a session unanimous consent is absolutely essential to the consideration of any measure. While this may result in the failure of some laudable propositions, the statute books are also protected against the imposition of much unwise and hasty legislation. The Senator who objects does so publicly, and is answerable to his own conscience and to his constituency for his action. If he thus records his opposition, it is safe to assume that he believes himself to be acting wisely; and experience proves that Senators are restrained from undue objection by a wholesome regard for the sentiments of their colleagues. It would have been in the power of Senator Tillman, for instance, to have blocked all legislation as soon as he had learned that his much-desired appropriation of \$250,000 for the Charleston exposition had been sacrificed. But, as a matter of fact, he did nothing of the kind. He could not have stood up against the torrent of indignation which would have been poured out upon him. Senator Carter, it is true, did defeat the River and Harbor Bill; but he was fully aware that in so doing he was acting in harmony with the sentiment of many of his colleagues, who regarded the bill as extravagant and harmful. If it had not been for the existence of this feeling, Mr. Carter never would have dared to take his stand in opposition, even though he was about to retire to private life.

In its own way, the Senate accomplishes more work — that is, it enacts more bills — than the House of Representatives. No Senator objects for the mere sake of objecting; because he is aware that if he is captious, he will himself encounter innumerable stumbling-blocks when he seeks the passage of measures in which he is interested. He is only one of ninety Senators, any one of whom has every privilege which he enjoys. It is the fact that each Senator is a power unto himself that gives the Senate its peculiar place in our system of government. When a vote upon a treaty or an important measure is to be canvassed, it is necessary to know the individual view of each Senator, a task frequently surrounded with some difficulty. There is more independence of thought and action in the Senate than in the House. Instances where two Senators of the same political party from the same State vote upon opposite sides of the same question are by no means rare, and, of late years, have become quite common. Party leaders, therefore, take occasion, during the days occupied in a prolonged debate, to investigate the condition of their own ranks, and strengthen, by such pressure as may be most effective, any weakness they may discover. The very necessity for this preliminary canvass emphasizes the individuality of each Senator, and makes him a power to be courted or feared.

The right of any Senator to speak at any time, upon any subject, and at any length, develops orators and debaters. No man who possesses a talent in this direction need lack for opportunity to prove his capacity. If he is really a great orator, if he actually demonstrates his logical and thoughtful mind, he forges to the front, and must be reckoned with by those who assume leadership. If, on the other hand, he is dull and slow-witted, lacking both strength of thought and forcefulness of expression, he will sink by his own weight. The right to speak cannot be denied him, but he will not command an audience; and very promptly will he recognize that he has ceased to be a factor of importance. In olden times, a new Senator maintained silence for a year or two before affording his colleagues an opportunity to judge of his capacity. He familiarized himself with his surroundings; he felt the ground securely under his feet, so to speak, before he essayed to venture into public notice. The *début* of a Senator was in those days a noteworthy event. It was his crucial test; and it was not without some fear and trembling that he invited the verdict of his colleagues. Nowadays, however, in the haste and rush of modern legislation, few Senators undergo the term of probation which was formerly customary. They plunge at once into the vortex of debate. Sometimes they emerge safely and creditably; but

more frequently they are carried underneath the surface, and in subsequent obscurity pay the penalty of their rashness.

Within the last few years some rich men have secured seats in the Senate, with comparative ease, through the manipulation of State politics; and their presence has given that body the nickname of "The Millionaires' Club." As a matter of fact, a large majority of the Senators are poor men. This is especially true of those who represent Southern States, who are proverbially lacking in plenitude of this world's goods. The millionaires in the Senate can be counted upon ten fingers. Some of them are notoriously rich, like Clark, of Montana, while large fortunes are undoubtedly possessed by Hanna, of Ohio; McMillan, of Michigan; Elkins, of West Virginia; Kearns, of Utah; Proctor, of Vermont; Aldrich, of Rhode Island; Turner, of Washington; Platt and Depew, of New York; and Wetmore, of Rhode Island. To two-thirds of the Senators the annual salary of \$5,000 is a consideration not to be despised. There are few perquisites to eke out this comparatively meagre compensation — none, in fact, worth mentioning. The Government provides one or two clerks to attend to the Senator's correspondence, which is always heavy; it allows a minimum of free stationery; and it returns some of his travelling expenses.

There is opportunity, of course, to make money through speculation; and some Senators avail themselves of it. One Senator, who was a large holder of Washington real estate, increased its value very materially by steering legislation for street improvements in its direction; while every manipulation of tariff schedules and of internal revenue taxation, affecting steel and iron, tobacco, whiskey, and sugar, reveals the close connection between the Senate of the United States and Wall Street. But this acquisitiveness, to call it by no harsher name, is, after all, confined to the few Senators who are noted for their commercial instincts. The majority of Senators do not speculate. They content themselves with their modest salary; and how they manage to live upon it is a daily wonder. The demands upon the Senatorial purse are incessant. Every Senator is persistently approached by stranded constituents, who expect, and generally receive, financial assistance. Unless he elects to live in absolute retirement, it is also incumbent upon him to maintain some social position. Occasionally a Senator will come to Washington with the idea that he can be something or somebody upon \$5,000 a year. It does not take many months to show him the futility of the effort. In fact, it is impossible for a Senator to save anything from his salary, unless he hides in a back street, burying himself like a hermit, neither

entertaining nor being entertained. In the diplomatic service, the leading ambassadorial positions are bestowed upon men whose *entourage* can be maintained by their private fortunes; and the time does not seem to be far distant when the Senate of the United States will be composed in large degree of rich men, simply because a poor man cannot afford to accept the position.

It is to the credit of the Senate that wealth is not yet the standard by which its members judge each other. There are millionaires in the Senate who occupy insignificant places, who are never consulted by their colleagues, and who simply follow where others lead. On the other hand, men who possess brains are consequential factors in determining legislation, although in material wealth they may be as poor as church mice. A man cannot rise to eminence in the Senate by wealth alone. Herein, it seems to me, is much basis for felicitation. Until this condition changes, the Senate will continue to be, what it is to-day, the greatest legislative body in the world. Of course, the time may come when the sordid influences which measure a man by the size of his bank account may control the Senate. Let us, at least, be thankful that this time has not yet arrived; and let us hope, for the sake of the Republic, that it will never come.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.

THE KAISER'S SPEECHES AND GERMAN HISTORY.

ALL Germany is up, in her daily press, against the recent strange pronouncements of Emperor William II. It is not many months since he startled and shocked public opinion by declaring that "no quarter is to be given," in the coming battles in China, and by his reference to the Etzel, or Attila, of the Nibelungen Lied. Not less extraordinary were his remarks about the blessings of culture which he said the ancient Romans had conferred upon Germany, when, in a kind of Cæsarean festival on the Saalburg, he revived, and was present at, a theatrical mummery, in the classic style of ancient Imperial Rome. Quite recently, to the astonishment of all, and without any apparent cause whatever, he announced, in a speech to a German regiment which takes its name from Czar Alexander, that if Berlin were to rise again, as in 1848, "in disobedience to its King," it would be put down by force of arms in the most vigorous manner.

I may mention, to the honor of the German press, that in regard to this latter harangue there has been universal disapproval and utter amazement, from the most Radical, or Socialistic journals, to the most moderate ones. Barring some ultra-reactionist paper here and there, which has always advocated violent measures of the Russian autocratic kind, there is such a unanimity of criticism of that incomprehensible threat as has never been the case since the present ruler's accession. Even journals known to receive semi-official communications from the highest Government quarters have joined in the chorus of wondering disapprobation.

Now, let us glance rapidly, in the light of history, at the several utterances just referred to. Here, a speech made in the Reichstag by the War Minister, Herr von Gossler, in support of his Imperial master, must be quoted. "What our troops are now doing in China," he said, "is only the revenge for what the Huns did among us for centuries!"

An amazing statement, truly. So it seems to be the duty of a highly civilized nation to avenge, by torrents of blood, after more than a thou-

sand years, what barbarians from further Asia had once done to its fore-bears!¹

Furthermore, Herr von Gossler, evidently speaking in the Kaiser's name, wrongly mixes up the earlier Huns with the later Magyars, against whose invasions Germany had also to contend. Were those Magyars, perchance, simply Chinese? A little more learning might be of advantage to a War Minister who thus preaches sanguinary retaliation at the distance of a thousand years. Why, the Hungarians of the present day are the best allies of the German Empire in the Triple Alliance!

The Kaiser seems, moreover, to be unaware that the Etzel of our Nibelungen Lied is very different from the historical Attila. No doubt, Etzel, in our national epic, has replaced the notorious "Scourge of God," as Attila was called; for both had their court on the Lower Danube. But any one who has studied the connection of the Nibelungen tale with the Edda, in which are preserved ancient German songs, that would else have been lost, must know that originally the whole Siegfried tale, including the death of Siegfried, was located on the Lower Rhine; that of yore, according to the Edda, a King Atli ruled there, who took for his spouse the widow of Siegfried, a German Hunic (not Hunnic) prince; but that after the great migrations, when a chaotic mixture of tribes and tales took place, the Mongolic Hunns, by a misunderstanding of words and names, were inserted in the German Nibelung story, instead of the Teutonic Hunes, after whom the Hunrück mountain and many other places are still named to this day. Then, too, Atli, the German ruler on the Lower Rhine, was changed into an Attila — or Etzel, as the form of that name is in High German speech; and the story of the revenge, after the murder of Siegfried, was transferred from the Rhine to the Danube.

The traces of this transformation are still visible in our epic. The Etzel of the Nibelungen Lied is not a cruel barbarian, like the Scourge of God, but a "noble prince," a "noble king." The water nixes in the Danube are called mermaids (*merewijo*), because, in the original tale, they hail from the Netherlands, near the shores of the German Ocean. Any one speaking of the Etzel of the Nibelung Lay should be clear about the difference in character between him and the Mongolic, Hunnic Attila of history. But enough of this. Let us now turn to the Romans.

Were the doctrine of revenge and retaliation, such as the Kaiser and

¹ But even then the historical question arises: Are the Huns of Attila, after all, synonymous with the Chinese? Do not, on the contrary, many scholars of the first rank maintain that the ancestors of the Huns, who harried Germany, Gaul, and Italy, were the Hiong-nu, who, in the early centuries of our era, waged war against the Chinese?

Herr von Gossler preach, to be considered right for that which happened a thousand or more years ago, how should we have to look upon the festival on the Saalburg, as organized by William II? Suppose Armin — or Hermann, as we usually, though wrongly, call him — the Liberator of Germany from the Roman yoke, who overthrew Varus in the Teutoburg forest, could suddenly have made his appearance on the ruins of that old Roman stronghold. What would he have said? Suppose the stones of the fortress could speak, the fortress which was erected for the purpose of robbing our ancestors of their independence, to impose upon them the laws and the language of an insatiable conqueror who pushed his World Empire as far as the land of the Britons — a country then divided, according to the Latin expression, from the whole circle of the earth (*toto divisos orbe Brittannos*).

Had the object of that structure on the Taunus range been attained, no document in the Latin language, or any address in that tongue, need have been composed by Mommsen, or by Herr Schulze, the director of a grammar school, on the occasion of those festivities; for we Germans should, in that case, all speak to-day a daughter-language of Latin. Yet, Emperor William, glorifying the deeds of Imperial Rome, actually exclaimed in his harangue:

“Here we see now, on the heights of the Taunus, arisen anew, like a phoenix from its ashes, the old Roman castle, a witness of Roman power, a link in the mighty iron chain which the legions of Rome put around the colossal Empire, forcing the will of Rome, at the bidding of a single Imperator, Cæsar Augustus, upon the world, and opening the whole world to that Roman culture which fell fertilizing before all, upon Germany.”

Well, we know, or, at least, we all ought to know, how this was effected. Tacitus has recorded what was done near the Taunus for carrying civilization into our country. Cæsar Germanicus, the noble warrior, who captured Thusnelda, the wife of Armin, and led her in triumph as a prisoner into Rome, raised, before he perpetuated this grand deed, a stronghold on the Taunus, in the place of one that had been built by his father. He then “fell upon the Chattians (Hessians) with such unexpected suddenness that all those who were weak, owing to sex or age, were at once captured or slaughtered.” In other words, neither women, children, nor old men were spared. Thus, in more than Hunnic manner, our ancestors were treated by that conquering power which seemed to be bent upon proving that it had grown from a wolfish suckling.

Germanicus generally passes for one of the noblest of Romans. Yet such was his usual procedure against the Germans. Tacitus writes:

"He wasted the country by fire and sword to the extent of fifty miles. Neither sex nor age found mercy. Sacred places, and ordinary dwellings, without distinction, even the Temple of Tamfana, the special resort of those nations, were levelled to the ground. The Roman soldiers massacred men who were half asleep, unarmed, or scattered about, whilst they themselves remained unwounded."

That was the famous struggle with the German Marsians between the Ems and the Lippe. They had caroused during a festival, and were fallen upon, by the Romans who massacred them, as they lay stretched, here and there, upon their beds, or near their tables, in perfect security; no watch having been stationed by them anywhere, and no fear of a hostile attack existing among them. In the languor of their inebriated condition they were simply butchered.

At the Weser river this highly cultured Cæsar Germanicus acted in the same way in the struggle against Armin and Inguiomar. In accordance with Roman custom, Gallic and Germanic troops were put, in battle, in the forefront. Of his own countrymen's behavior Germanicus was, however, not sure. So he disguised himself, by hanging a deer-skin on his shoulders, in order to appear like a German auxiliary; and thus, without an attendant, he went by a secret path, where there were no sentinels, round the camp, eagerly listening to what the soldiers were saying. When one of the enemy, who understood Latin, rode up to the entrenchments and with a loud voice made offers to those who would go over to Armin, the answer came from the indignant ranks of the legions that

"the Roman soldiers would give battle, and then take the lands of the Germans, and lead away their wives by right of conquest; for they looked upon the wealth and the women of the enemy as their destined prey."

Such were the seeds of culture that fell fertilizing, according to William II., upon the soil of Germany from the hands of Imperial Rome.

Not less instructive is the account Tacitus gives of the battle that followed. The Germans had neither helmet nor coat of mail. They had only shields made of twigs, and were otherwise indifferently armed. Nevertheless, thanks to their bravery, the unequal struggle lasted from nine in the morning until night, and "this slaughter of the foe filled the country for ten miles with corpses and weapons." Then the soldiers saluted Tiberius as Imperator, upon the field of battle, and heaped up the German arms, after the manner of trophies.

Still, the wrath of our forebears, fighting, against such odds, for their independence and freedom, was only increased by such treatment. Forthwith they renewed the struggle. "They grasp their weapons; the

common people, the nobles, the young, the aged, all rush suddenly upon the Roman army on its march, and throw it into confusion." In order to encourage his troops, Germanicus, to be more easily known, pulled off his helmet, and

"admonished his men to continue the slaughter. They wanted no prisoners. The extermination of the people alone would put an end to the war. As it was late in the day, he drew off a legion to pitch the camp. The others glutted themselves till night with the blood of the enemy. The cavalry fought with doubtful success."

No prisoners are to be made. With the blood of the foe the Roman soldiers are to glut themselves. The German people must be exterminated. These were the blessings of civilization which the much-praised Germanicus was to bring to our country. And a Kaiser of to-day celebrates the performance by an oratorical paeon!

But things were to happen differently from what the Roman general imagined. Presently, his attempt to take back the greater part of his troops on a fleet through the German Ocean, led, owing to the perils of the stormy sea, to such losses, and wrecks, and dreadful sufferings, that he alone reached the coast of the Chaucians with his galley. There, during the whole time of his stay, "he reproached himself, day and night, as the author of such wholesale destruction, and could hardly be kept by his friends from ending his own life in that same sea."

In one of these battles, Armin and Inguiomar were saved by Chaucian mercenaries in the Roman army, who recognized them, but nevertheless let them through, when they fought their way, in retreat, on horseback. For, among the German mercenaries who had become faithless to their fatherland, not a few often left the ranks of its enemies on decisive occasions. The traitor Segest, the father-in-law of Armin, who handed over his own daughter to the Romans as a captive, and who had even once put Armin in chains, in order to please the "divine Augustus," from whom he had received civic rights at Rome, remained faithful to the foreign oppressor. The wretched knave may be seen in the famous picture of Piloty, hiding in the shade, at the triumphal entry of Germanicus, when Thusnelda, Armin's wife, was led along, as a prisoner, together with her little son Thumelik, and a number of chieftains. Strabo, the Greek historian, gives these details; for the statement of Tacitus, that the Greeks knew nothing of the Liberator of Germany, is a mistake.

If Armin could have appeared on the Saalburg! What would have been his feelings in the presence of all that theatrical apparition of Romans in martial array and in the toga; of wreath-crowned boys, scattering flowers and swinging censers; of "*Salve Imperator*" songs and Latin

harangues; of Roman priests and generals, and Germanic chieftains or princes who had sold themselves to the country's enemy — as unfortunately also happened even in later centuries in our history?

Did not, however, Segest's son, Segimund, once tear the Roman sacerdotal fillets from his own head and go over to the defenders of his fatherland, until his traitorous father made him join the country's enemy once more? How Armin flew about among his Cheruscans, calling them to arms against Segest and Germanicus! "Oh, what a noble father! Oh, what a great general! What a brave army, whose numerous hands have carried off a helpless bit of a woman!" So the Liberator exclaimed with mocking admonition. How he fired and animated the Germans against the traitorous fellow Segest, who "had been the guilty cause of their having seen, between the Rhine and the Elbe, the Roman rods and axes, and the toga!" How he stormed against these so-called bringers of culture, who, with executions and the enforcement of tribute, had thrown other nations into an infamous servitude!

Thus the Liberator spoke; and thus again he shouted, in wrathful language, across the Weser, when speaking to his brother Flavus, the golden-haired Cheruscan, who had lost an eye in battling for Roman dominion. In the name of the fatherland, in the name of the time-honored, inherited freedom of the Germans, of their own Gods, and of their mother, who hoped that a son of hers would not become a traitor to his kinsmen and his race, Armin conjured the brother to come over to their country's cause. He spoke, or rather shouted, partly in his native German tongue, partly in Latin, so that the Roman warriors, standing away in the rear of Flavus, might also understand his words. At last, the two, coming to mutual insult, became so angry that even the dividing Weser would not have prevented them from fratricidal single combat, had not the leader of the Roman cavalry, Stertinus, held back Flavus, who, full of rage, was calling for his weapons and his horse, whilst on the opposite side Armin, amidst furious threats, was challenging him to battle.

Are we to forget all that Imperial Rome, which built up a World Empire on the ruins of nationalities, which kept no treaty-faith, and shrank back from no cruel misdeed, perpetrated against our ancestors? Yea, even the stones of the Saalburg speak of it. Or are we, on the other hand, to take revenge upon the Italians of to-day, with whom we are at peace, amity, and alliance? What a colossal folly that would be!

In my opinion, it would have been more fitting to let the Saalburg that ancient Roman Zwing Uri, continue to lie in ruins, and to erect

near it a place, a museum, for the collection of the objects found near the spot. The Romanizing, Imperializing, theatrical mummery which was arranged by the court of Berlin ought not to have taken place. It is not worthy of the historical recollections I have above given of the struggles for German independence and freedom.

Could we possibly imagine that in England, where there is no lack of Roman ruins, a similar celebration would be held to that ordained by William II? Who in England would have dared to organize a masquerade of ancient Romans, and of British chieftains serving under them, with Latin harangues in honor of Victoria, *Regina et Imperatrix*, or of King Edward, *Rex et Imperator*? And yet, such a festivity would not even affect the dignity of the Anglo-Saxon race from which Englishmen hail; for Roman dominion in Britain preceded the conquest of that country by German tribes. A festivity of that kind would, consequently, only typify the rule of the Romans over the aboriginal Keltic and Iberian population of a country which takes its present name from the German Angles.

Or could we imagine that the Italians would institute a similar celebration in honor of the Kimbrians and the Teutons, of the Marcomans and the Alemanns, of the Goths and the Lombards, who invaded, or even settled in, Italy? Is it thinkable that the Italians would, for such a purpose, put on helmets decorated with the open jaws of terrible wild beasts; that they would carry white, shining shields, double-edged javelins, and large, broad swords, such as Plutarch describes the armament of the Teutonic invaders to have been; and that, on the occasion of such a celebration, harangues would be addressed in Gothic to the King of Italy?

A World Empire Rome had become; and tyrants, criminals, libertines, and madmen arose in it. It was indeed a real World Empire with no other by its side. It lasted until the assault of German tribes brought about its fall. *That* was an historical revenge and retaliation.

The later struggles for German dominion in Italy, in opposition to the Papal claim of universal dominion, might even be interpreted as a continuation of this historical revenge. The Papacy — as Gibbon has it — sat, like a ghost, on the ruins of the preceding Roman World Power; and Rome continued its pretensions, though in priestly garb. In those struggles, however, our own unity as a nation came to grief. Our ancient liberties were broken down more and more. The Barbarossas and their ilk found greater pleasure in a Roman *Lex Majestatis* than in the bold speech to which Germans, as a people, were accustomed — a boldness still observable in Luther as well as Hans Sachs, the head of the Meister-

singers. Only read what Luther, in the beginning of his career, said about tyrannical princes in his own country. Or read what cautious Melanchthon complained of in regard to the "all too free speech of Germans," as he called it in his timorous disposition. What would become of any one in the Germany of to-day who ventured to speak out as Luther and Hans Sachs did against oppressive princes?

Now, let us turn to the most recent harangue of William II, in which — imitating, in this, his grandfather — he suddenly came out with incomprehensible threats about any possible renewal of the revolutionary rising of 1848. Here I shall first quote a letter from a Berlin correspondent whose views are far removed from advanced Liberalism even — not to mention democratic principles. He writes:

"The Kaiser has made a grave mistake. Because, a short time ago, a crazy woman at Breslau, and now a half-witted young workingman at Bremen, have done a thing for which, as the doctors declare, neither of them can be held mentally responsible — is that a reason for the Head of the State to declare war, so to say, against the population of Berlin? Who dreams, in the capital of the German Empire, or anywhere in the country, of a rising by force of arms? Are such wild assertions calculated to strengthen our position in regard to foreign Powers in the West and the East? The Emperor says he is convinced that he 'would be victorious, even though we are surrounded by foes, and though we shall have to fight, as a minority, against a majority of enemies.' But is it wise thus to paint on the wall dangers from abroad and dangers from within? He calls out that 'there lives a powerful ally of his — that is, the good old God in Heaven, who ever since the time of the Great Prince Elector and of the Great King (Frederick II) has always been on our side.' Has the Kaiser then forgotten that, thanks to our internal divisions in the beginning of this century, we were overrun by Napoleon I and kept practically for years under a foreign yoke, and that no help came from what he is pleased to call his 'ally'?"

The letter also deals with the complaint of William II that "the spirit of brutality is on the increase among the youth of the country." Here the writer observes:

"But was it wise to say this so shortly after certain speeches, in which the memory of Attila was called up, for the purpose of preaching revenge upon the Chinese kinsmen of the Huns after the lapse of fifteen hundred years, and declaring that 'no quarter must be given'? Is a spirit of humanity thus to be promoted, and brutality to be kept in check? I am afraid all these utterances are only making for evil, while the Emperor asserts that he is combating the 'evil spirit of the times.' It is a pity that he saps in this way his own position. There is already too much alienation between the masses and himself on account of South African affairs, in which he has so entirely veered around as to offend, I may literally say, the whole nation. He really cannot afford to continue making enemies among all classes and all parties by these menaces of shooting down his own Berliners, 'if they were to repeat their rebellious disobedience of 1848.' People now bring to mind that some years ago he spoke of the duty of soldiers to kill their own fathers and brothers, if need be, in such a struggle, and everybody asks: 'What does it all mean?' It is too sad for words!"

I have given these extracts because they come from one who would even resent being considered an adherent of democratic views. At the same time he feels what Prussia and Germany at large owe to the grand national movement of 1848–49, in which so much precious blood of men of all classes and ranks was spilt, and so many were martyred by imprisonment and exile. Even the most moderate men now acknowledge, if they are not bereft of all feeling of justice and of all logic, that without the stirring events of those years, the later revival of the country, its attainment of whatever unity, freedom, and social progress it possesses at present, would have been impossible.

From the downfall of her Empire in 1806, through the Napoleonic invasion, Germany was, until 1848, a mere loose Confederation of Princes, each pretending to absolute sovereignty within his dominion, however large or small. Since the old Reichstag, or common parliament, had been abolished, there was no national representation for the Fatherland. The smaller kingdoms and principalities had local diets, but without practical power. Austria and Prussia were without any parliaments at all! The press was gagged and kept under censorship. Except on the left bank of the Rhine, there was no trial by jury. A German was virtually a stranger in every other German state than the one he had been born in. He could be expelled from all other states. Criminal offences of all kinds were investigated and adjudged in secret. The police were all-powerful. The so-called Diet of Frankfort, the central authority of Germany, including both Austria and Prussia, as well as the minor states, was composed of the official delegates of monarchs. It simply formed a superior committee of Political Police, issuing laws and ordinances of the most oppressive and arbitrary kind. There was no right of free meeting. Patriots who aimed at a national and free reconstitution of the common Fatherland were thrown into dungeons, and frequently driven, by down-right torture, to commit suicide. Czar Nicholas I exercised a decisive influence upon German princes. The harsh foreign dominion in the German Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, whose old constitution had been overthrown, had to be borne without the prospect of remedy.

Then came the great upheaval which William II now attacks as a "disobedience to a king." In every German state the people rose with arms in hand, or by "storm petition," as it was called. Austria and Prussia obtained parliaments of their own. A National Assembly, or Reichstag, was convoked in Frankfort, the old free city where Emperors were formerly elected for life. In that Assembly, Freiherr von Gagern, as speaker, a very moderate Liberal, literally proclaimed the

sovereignty of the people. In that parliament sat the deputies of Prussia, of the federal German provinces of Austria, and of all the minor states, including Schleswig-Holstein, whose people had also risen and formed an army of their own. The freedom of the press, the right of meeting, trial by jury, religious liberty — all the rights of citizenship and of personal freedom which exist in truly constitutional countries — were proclaimed. A German was henceforth a citizen all over the common Fatherland. A beginning was made of a national navy. Though by a narrow majority — the minority being largely imbued with Republican principles — the reconstruction of the Empire was decreed, and the crown offered to the then King of Prussia, Frederick William IV. He, who afterward ended as a lunatic, refused it. In the final struggle which thereupon ensued, the National Parliament and its executive, which had sought refuge at Stuttgart, were dissolved by force of arms. After many battles in the open field in southwestern Germany, the vanquished popular parties were punished by bloodthirsty courts-martial, by mass imprisonments, by confiscation of property, and by exile.

Nevertheless, it was the spirit of 1848–49, which some twenty years later fired the German nation in the war of defence against the aggression of Napoleon III. Then the very Prince, William I of Prussia, who had cruelly helped in overthrowing the movement of 1848–49, and had court-martialed many of the best patriots, was compelled to make a change of policy in the progressive sense. A German Parliament was restored. The different states — which even after the defeat of the Revolution had retained their parliamentary institutions, the freedom of the press, trial by jury, etc. — were combined into a closer union. The King of Prussia was elected German Emperor. A national army and navy were restored. To put it briefly, a great deal, if by no means everything, of that which the movement of 1848 had initiated was now reintroduced.

Well may people all over Germany therefore ask: Would there be a Reichstag, an Emperor William II, or even that navy to which he rightly attributes such great importance, without the "disobedience to kings" in 1848? And well may we ask, in view of all the facts above given: Are not the present Kaiser's recent utterances all shown by the clearest facts of history to be grave misconceptions?

KARL BLIND.

THE RELIGION OF A COLLEGE STUDENT.

We have heard many appeals to the college student concerning his duty to the Christian church. He should be, it is urged, a more constant attendant at its worship; he should commit himself more openly to its cause; he should guard himself against the infidelity and indecision which attack him with such strategy under the conditions of college life. May it not be of advantage, however, to consider this relation from the opposite point of view? May it not be instructive to inquire what the Christian church must provide in order to meet the needs of an educated young man, and what the college student demands that the church shall teach and illustrate? What has a young man the right to demand as a condition of his loyalty and devotion? What is there which the Christian church must learn concerning the character and ideals of a normal, educated, modern youth before it can hope to lead the heart of such a youth to an unconstrained obedience? What is the religion of a college student?

There are, of course, certain limitations to such an inquiry. We must assume on both sides open-mindedness, teachableness, seriousness, and good faith. We cannot take into account either a foolish student or a foolish church. There are, on the one hand, some youths of the college age whom no conceivable adaptation of religious teaching can hope to reach. They are self-absorbed, self-conscious, self-satisfied, self-conceited. There is little that the church can do for them but to pray that, as they grow older, they may grow more humble, and, therefore, more teachable. On the other hand, there are some methods of religious activity which cannot reasonably anticipate the coöperation of educated men. Here and there an imaginative young person may be won by emotional appeals or ecclesiastical picturesqueness; but the normal type of thoughtful youth demands of the church soberness, intellectual satisfaction, and verifiable claims. We must dismiss from consideration both the unreasoning youth and the unreasonable church. We set before ourselves, on the one hand, an alert, open-minded, well-trained youth, looking out with eager eyes into the mystery of the universe; and, on the other hand,

a thoughtful, candid, sensible church, resting its claim not on tradition or passion, but on its perception and maintenance of verifiable truth. How shall these two factors of modern life — the chief factors of its future stability — the life of thoughtful youth and the truth of the Christian religion, come to know and help each other; and what are the traits of Christian teaching which must be unmistakably recognized before it can commend itself to the young student of the modern world?

To these questions it must be answered, that the religion of a college student is marked, first of all, by a passion for reality. No effort of the church is more mistaken than the attempt to win the loyalty of intelligent young people by multiplying the accessories or incidentals of the religious life — its ecclesiastical forms, its emotional ecstasies, its elaborateness of organization, its opportunities of sociability. The modern college student, while in many respects very immature, is extraordinarily alert in his discernment of anything which seems to him of the nature of indirectness or unreality. He has a passion for reality. The first demand he makes of his companions or his teachers is the demand for sincerity, straightforwardness, and simplicity. He is not likely to be won to the Christian life by any external persuasion, laboriously planned "to draw in young people," and to make religion seem companionable and pleasant. These incidental activities of the church have their unquestionable usefulness as expressions of Christian sentiment and service, but they are misapplied when converted into decoys. They are corollaries of religious experience, not preliminaries of it; they are what one wants to do when he is a Christian, but not what makes a thoughtful man believe in Christ. The modern young man sees these things just as they are. Indeed, he is inclined to be on his guard against their strategy. He will nibble at the bait, but he will not take the hook. He will consume the refreshments of the church, he will serve on its committees, he will enjoy its æsthetic effects, but he still withdraws himself from the personal consecration which these were designed to induce. He will accept no substitute for reality. He wants the best. He is not old enough to be diffident or circuitous in his desires; he does not linger in the outer courts of truth; he marches straight into the Holy of Holies, and lifts the veil from the central mystery. Thus the church often fails of its mission to the student, because it imagines him to be frivolous and indifferent, when in reality he is tremendously in earnest and passionately sincere.

And suppose, on the other hand, that the church meets this candid creature just where he is, and, instead of offering him accessories and inci-

dental as adapted to his frivolous mind, presents to him, with unadorned and sober reasonableness, the realities of religion. What discovery is the church then likely to make? It may discover, to its own surprise, and often to the surprise of the youth himself, an unanticipated susceptibility in him to religious reality, and a singular freshness and vitality of religious experience. A great many people imagine that the years from seventeen to twenty-two are not likely to be years of natural piety. The world, it is urged, is just making its appeal to the flesh and to the mind with overmastering power, while the experience of life has not yet created for itself a stable religion. Fifteen years ago it was determined in Harvard University that religion should be no longer regarded as a part of academic discipline but should be offered to youth as a privilege and an opportunity. It was then argued by at least one learned person that the system was sure to fail because, by the very conditions of their growth, young men were unsusceptible to religion. They had outgrown, he urged, the religion of their childhood, and had not yet grown into the religion of their maturity; so that a plan which rested on faith in the inherent religiousness of young men was doomed to disappointment. If, however, the voluntary system of religion applied to university life has proved anything in these fifteen years, it has proved the essentially religious nature of the normal, educated young man of America. To offer religion not as an obligation of college life, but as its supreme privilege, was an act of faith in young men. It assumed that when religion was honestly and intelligently presented to the mind of youth it would receive a reverent and responsive recognition.

The issue of this undertaking has serious lessons for the Christian church. It disposes altogether of the meagre expectation with which the life of youth is frequently regarded. I have heard a preacher, addressing a college audience, announce that just as childhood was so assailed by infantile diseases and mishaps that it was surprising to see any child grow up, so youth was assailed by so many sins that it was surprising to see any young man grow up unstained. There is no rational basis for this enervating scepticism. The fact is that it is natural for a young man to be good, just as it is natural for a child to grow up. A much wiser word was spoken by one of my colleagues, who, having been asked to address an audience on the temptations of the college life, said that he should devote himself chiefly to its temptations to excellence. A college boy, that is to say, is not, as many suppose, a peculiarly misguided and essentially light-minded person. He is, on the contrary, set in conditions which tempt to excellence and is peculiarly responsive to

every sincere appeal to his higher life. Behind the mask of light-mindedness or self-assertion which he assumes, his interior life is wrestling with fundamental problems, as Jacob wrestled with the angel and would not let it go until it blessed him. "Your young men," said the prophet, with deep insight into the nature of youth, "shall see visions." They are our natural idealists. The shades of the prison-house of common life have not yet closed about their sense of the romantic, the heroic, the noble.

To this susceptibility of youth the church, if it is wise, must address its teaching. It must believe in a young man, even when he does not believe in himself. It must attempt no adaptation of truth to immaturity or indifference. It must assume that a young man, even though he disguises the fact by every subterfuge of modesty or mock defiance, is a creature of spiritual vision, and that his secret desire is to have that vision interpreted and prolonged. When Jesus met the young men whom he wanted for his disciples, his first relation with them was one of absolute, and apparently unjustified, confidence. He believed in them and in their spiritual responsiveness. He disclosed to them the secrets of their own hearts. He dismissed accessories and revealed realities. He did not cheapen religion or make small demands. He bade these men leave all and follow him. He took for granted that their nature called for the religion he had to offer, and he gave it to them without qualification or fear. The young men, for whom the accidental aspects of religion were thus stripped away and its heart laid bare, leaped to meet this revelation of reality. "We have found the Messiah," they told each other. They had been believed in even before they believed in themselves, and that which the new sense of reality disclosed to them as real, they at last in reality became.

Such is the first aspect of the religion of the student—its demand for reality. To reach the heart of an educated young man the message of the church must be unequivocal, uncomplicated, genuine, masculine, direct, real. This, however, is but a part of a second quality in the religion of educated youth. The teaching of the church to which such a mind will listen must be, still further, consistent with truth as discerned elsewhere. It must involve no partition of life between thinking and believing. It must be, that is to say, a rational religion. The religion of a college student is one expression of his rational life. To say this is not to say that religion must be stripped of its mystery or reduced to the level of a natural science in order to commend itself to educated youth. On the contrary, the tendencies of the higher education lead in precisely the opposite direction. They lead to the conviction that

all truth, whether approached by the way of science, philosophy, art, or religion, opens before a serious student into a world of mystery, a sense of the unattained, a spacious region of idealism, where one enters with reverence and awe. Instead of demanding that religion shall be reduced to the level of other knowledge, it will appear to such a student more reasonable to demand that all forms of knowledge shall be lifted into the realm of faith, mystery, and idealism. It is, however, quite another matter to discover in the teaching of religion any fundamental inconsistency with the spirit of research and the method of proof which the student elsewhere candidly accepts; and we may be sure that it is this sense of inconsistency which is the chief source of any reaction from religious influence now to be observed among educated young men.

Under the voluntary system of religion at Harvard University we have established a meeting-place, known as "The Preacher's Room," where the minister conducting morning prayers spends some hours each day in free and unconstrained intimacy with such students as may seek him. This room has witnessed many frank confessions of religious difficulty and denial, and as each member of our staff of preachers recalls his experiences at the university he testifies that the most fruitful hours of his service have been those of confidential conference in the privacy of The Preacher's Room. But if one were further called to describe those instances of religious bewilderment and helplessness which have seemed to him in his official duty most pathetic and most superfluous, he would not hesitate to admit that they were the by no means infrequent cases of young men who have been brought up in a conception of religion which becomes untenable under the conditions of university life. A restricted denominationalism, a backward-looking ecclesiasticism, an ignorant defiance of biblical criticism, and, no less emphatically, an intolerant and supercilious liberalism — these habits of mind become simply impossible when a young man finds himself thrown into a world of wide learning, religious liberty, and intellectual hospitality. Then ensues, for many a young mind, a pathetic and even tragic period of spiritual hesitation and reconstruction. The young man wanders through dry places, seeking rest and finding none; and it is quite impossible for his mind to say: "I will return unto my house from whence I came out." Meantime his loving parents and his anxious pastor observe with trembling his defection from the old ways, deplore the influence of the university upon religious faith, and pray for a restoration of belief which is as contrary to nature as the restoration of the oak to the acorn from which it grew.

Now, in all this touching experience, where is the gravest blame to be laid? It must, no doubt, be confessed that among the conditions of college life there are some which tend to encourage in a young man a certain pertness and priggishness of mind which make the old ways of faith seem old-fashioned and primitive. Indeed, it seems to some young men that any way of faith is superfluous to a thorough man of the world, such as the average sophomore ought to be. But these cheerful young persons, for whom the past has no lessons and the future no visions, and for whom the new ideal of self-culture has for the moment suppressed the earlier ideals of self-sacrifice or service, are not a type of student life which need be taken seriously. They are the lookers-on of the academic world, the dilettante and amateur minds in a community of scholars. The strenuous game of real learning goes on; and these patrons of the strife sit, as it were, along the side lines and wear the college colors, but do not participate in the training or the conflict or the victory. We are thinking of that much more significant body of youth who are in deadly earnest with their thought, and who find it an essential of their intellectual peace to attain some sense of unity in their conception of the world. For this type of college youth — the most conscientious, most thoughtful, most precious — the blame for inconsistency between the new learning and the inherited faith lies, for the most part, not with the college, but with the church. There was once a time when these young minds could be secluded by solicitous parents and anxious pastors from most of the signs of change in modern thought. They could be prohibited from approaching great tracts of literature; they could be hidden in the cloistered life of a strictly guarded college; their learning could be ensured to be in safe conformity with a predetermined creed. There is now no corner of the intellectual world where this seclusion is possible. Out of the most unexpected sources — a novel, a poem, a newspaper — issues the contagion of modern thought; and, in an instant, the life that has been shut in and has seemed secure is hopelessly affected.

And how does the young man, touched with the modern spirit, come to regard the faith which he is thus forced to reject? Sometimes he regards it with a sense of pathos, as an early love soon lost; sometimes with a deep indignation, as the source of scepticism and denial. For one educated youth who is alienated from religion by the persuasions of science, philosophy, or art, ten, we may be sure, are thus affected by the irrational or impracticable teaching of religion. It is not an inherent issue between learning and faith which forces them out of the church in which they were born; it is an unscientific and reactionary

theory of faith. It is not the college which must renew its conformity to the church; it is the church which must open its eyes to the marvellous expansion of intellectual horizon which lies before the mind of every college student to-day.

There is another aspect of the same experience. This process of intellectual growth is often accompanied, not by a reaction from religion, but by a new appreciation of its reasonableness. In a degree which few who represent the church have as yet realized, the expansion of the sphere of truth is at the same time an enlargement and enrichment of religious confidence. There is going on, within the college, often without the knowledge of the church, a restoration of religious faith through the influence of intellectual liberty. I have seen more than one student come to college in a mood of complete antagonism to his earlier faith, and then I have seen that same youth in four years graduate from college, and with a passionate consecration give himself to the calling of the Christian ministry which he had so lately thought superfluous and outgrown. It was the simple consequence of his discovery that the religious life is not in conflict with the interests and aims of a university, but is precisely that ideal of conduct and service toward which the spirit of a university logically leads. "I beseech you, brethren," says the Apostle who knew most about the relation of philosophy to faith, "that ye present . . . a reasonable service." It is a charge which the Christian church still needs to hear. The service of the church which is to meet the religion of a college student must be a reasonable service, consistent with all reverent truth-seeking, open to the light, hospitable to progress, rational, teachable, free. The church which sets itself against the currents of reasonable thought, and has for great words like Evolution, Higher Criticism, Morality, Beauty, Law, only an undiscerning sneer, is in reality not the defender of the faith, but a positive contributor to the infidelity of the present age. The church which asks no loyalty that is not rational, no service of the heart that is not an offering of the mind, comes with its refreshing message to many a bewildered young mind, and is met by a renewed dedication to a reasonable service.

So far, however, I have described the religion of a college student as it appears in every thoughtful age. There remains one aspect of the religious life which is peculiarly characteristic of a college student in our own generation, and of which the church in its relation to the young must take fresh account. Protestant teaching, from the time of Luther, has laid special emphasis on the Pauline distinction between faith and

works. It is not a man's performance, either of moral obligations or ritual observances, that justifies him in the sight of God. He must offer that total consecration of the heart, that conversion of the nature, which makes him find his life in God. This teaching was a necessary protest against the externalism and ecclesiastical practices which had been for centuries regarded by many as of the essence of the religious life. "We are justified by faith;" "the just shall live by faith"—these great words give to religion a profounder, more spiritual, and more personal significance as a relation between the individual soul and the living God.

But suppose that this touch of the life of God is felt by the soul of man, and that the soul desires to express its religious life—what is to be its channel of utterance? The history of Protestantism for the most part answers: "The organ of religious expression is the tongue. When the life is moved by the Holy Ghost, it is led to speak as the spirit gives it utterance. It tells rejoicingly of its new birth; it confesses Christ before its fellows; it preaches to others the message which has brought it hope and peace." Here is the basis of a large part of the organization of the Protestant churches—their meetings for free expression of prayer; their association for religious utterance; their test of faith through spoken confession. It is obvious that this channel of expression is legitimate and often inevitable. The fulness of religious emotion which descends from God to man leaps out of many lives into forms of speech, as naturally as the water which descends from the high hills leaps out from its conduit into the air.

What the present age, however, is teaching us, as the world was never taught before, is that another and equally legitimate channel of expression is open to the life of faith. It is the language of works. We have come in these days to a time devoted in an unprecedented degree to the spirit of philanthropy. It is the age of social service. No life can yield itself to the current of the time without being swept into its movement of passionate fraternity and social justice. But what is the attitude of the Christian church to this modern phenomenon of social service? It is quite true that the church is one of the most active agents of this philanthropic renaissance. The sense of social responsibility is manifested by the prodigious increase of parish charities, parish organizations, institutional churches, and general benevolence. The church, however, has failed adequately to recognize the legitimate place of action as a trustworthy witness of faith. To do for others has seemed to the tradition of the church a superadded and secondary effect of religion, not one of its essential and original factors. First, one is to be religious; and

then, as a consequence or ornament of his religion, he is to concern himself with the better ordering of the human world.

A much deeper relation between faith and works is indicated by those solemn words in which Jesus sums up, as he says, "the whole law and the prophets." There is, he teaches, a kinship of nature between the love of God and the love of man. The second commandment is like the first. Both are parts of a complete religion. When a modern life, that is to say, is moved by the spirit of philanthropy, that impulse is not something which the church may stand apart from and commend as of another sphere. It is, in fact, one legitimate expression of the religious life; uttering itself not by the tongue, but by the hand, as though there had been heard the great word of the Apostle: "If a man love not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" In other words, the church has permitted this modern movement of philanthropy to proceed as though it were not an essential part of the Christian life, when in reality this whole vast enterprise is the way in which the modern world is actually uttering that faith in the possible redemption of mankind, to accomplish which the church of Jesus Christ was expressly designed and inspired. I stood one day in the house of a women's settlement, set in the most squalid conditions of the life of a city and purifying the neighborhood with its unassuming devotion, and a minister of the Christian church who was present looked about him and said: "This is a very beautiful and noble work, but I wish there were more of Christ in it." How could there, one felt like asking, be more of Christ than was already there? Would technical confession or oral expression add any significance to such a work in his eyes who said: "Not every one that sayeth to me, Lord, Lord, but he that doeth the will of my Father"? Was there ever, indeed, a work more full of Christ? Might not Jesus, if he should come again on earth, pass without notice many a splendid structure reared in his name, and, seeking out these servants of the broken-hearted and the bruised of the world, say to them: "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of these least, ye have done it unto me"? Why is the church not far-sighted enough to claim for herself what is justly her own? She clings to the test of faith by a single form of expression, when in fact the spirit of God is manifesting itself at the present time by another way of expression. And so it comes to pass that the most immediate problem for the church is to find a place within her religious experience for the new manifestation of self-effacing philanthropy, and to claim the age of social service as at heart an age of faith.

Now, at precisely this point, where the first expression of the spirit of God takes the form of the service of man, the Christian church meets the religion of the college student. The normal type of a serious-minded young man at the present time does not talk much about religion. Sometimes this reserve proceeds from self-consciousness and ought to be overcome, but quite as often it proceeds from modesty and ought to be revered. At any rate, such is the college student — a person disinclined to much profession of piety, and not easy to shape into the earlier type of expressed discipleship. Yet, at the same time, this young man is extraordinarily responsive to the new call for human service. I suppose that never in the history of education were so many young men and young women in our colleges profoundly stirred by a sense of social responsibility and a passion for social justice. The first serious question which the college student asks is not, "Can I be saved? Do I believe?" but, "What can I do for others? What can I do for those less fortunate than I?" No one can live in a community of these young lives without perceiving a quality of self-sacrificing altruism so beautiful and so eager that it is akin to the emotions which in other days brought in a revival of religion.

What is the duty of the church to a mood like this? The duty of the church — or rather the privilege of the church — is to recognize that this is a revival of religion; that in this generous movement of human sympathy there is a legitimate and acceptable witness of the life of God in the soul of the modern world. It may not be that form of evidence which other times have regarded as valid; it may, perhaps, not be the most direct way of religious expression; but none the less it happens to be the way through which the Holy Spirit is at the present time directing the emotional life of youth to natural utterance. "I am not very religious," said one frank youth to me one day, "but I should like to do a little to make of Harvard College something more than a winter watering-place." But was not that youth religious? Was it not the Spirit of God which was stirring his young heart? What, indeed, is the final object of religion if it is not to include the making of that better world which he in his dream desired to see? In this quality of the religion of a college student the church must believe. It must take him as he is, and let him testify by conduct if he will not testify by words. If the student might be assured that the religion which the church represents is a practical, working, ministering faith; if he could see that the mission of the church was not the saving of a few fortunate souls from a wrecked and drifting world, but the bringing of the world itself, like a still sea-

worthy vessel, with its whole cargo of hopes and fears, safe to its port; if he could believe that in the summons of the time to unselfish service he was in reality hearing the call of the Living God; then he would see in the church not, as he is often inclined to see, an obstinate defender of impossible opinions, or a hothouse for exotic piety, or a cold storage warehouse to preserve traditions which would perish in the open air, but the natural expression of organized righteousness, the body of those who are sanctified for others' sakes, and to such a church he would offer his honest and practical loyalty.

These are the tests to which the church must submit if it would meet the religion of a college student —the tests of reality, reasonableness, and practical service. A religion without reality — formal, external, technical, obscurantist; a religion without reasonableness — omniscient, dogmatic, timid; a religion which does not greet the spirit of practical service as the spirit of Christ — a religion of such a kind may win the loyalty of emotional or theological or ecclesiastical minds, but it is not acceptable to the normal type of educated American youth. Such natures demand first a genuine, then a rational, and then a practical, religion, and they are held to the Christian church by no bond of sentiment or tradition which will prevent their seeking a more religious life elsewhere. And what is this but a wholesome challenge to the church of Christ to renew its vitality at the sources of its real power? The intellectual issues of the present time are too real to be met by artificiality and too rational to be interpreted by traditionalism; the practical philanthropy of the present time is too absorbing and persuasive to be subordinated or ignored. It is a time for the church to dismiss all affectations and all assumptions of authority, and to give itself to the reality of rational religion and to the practical redemption of an unsanctified world. This return to simplicity and service will be at the same time a recognition of the religion of a college student and a renewal of the religion of Jesus Christ.

FRANCIS G. PEABODY.

J.

THE HOUSEKEEPER'S STONE.

THE science of to-day has but a cynical smile for the deluded alchemist who published "The Key of Wisdom" and "A Secret Book on the Philosopher's Stone;" yet for nearly eight centuries the world has profited incalculably by his invention of soap. Baffled in the attempt to transmute the baser metals into gold, he discovered something infinitely better — a boon to the race.

Doubtless, he who modestly claims to have discovered the Housekeeper's Stone will be classed with the lamented author of the mystical books alluded to; yet, in full confidence of the result, the writer recommends an intelligent, patient trial of his recipe in the solution of some of the vexed problems of domestic economy. Let him premise, however, that he is not a quack, and does not proffer a cure-all for the ills of the kitchen. The wisest of physicians defers humbly to Dame Nature, and in his confidential moments avows that he simply touches a button and she does the rest.

The remedy proposed for the embarrassments ensuing from reliance upon domestic service is as old as the hills. It would not warrant copyrighting, and yet it may startle not a few readers. It embraces as its most vital feature the elimination of the title "servant" from our designation of household workers. No just reason can be given for its exclusive use in this connection. In truth, we are all servants of each other — or ought so to be; but the word wears an offensive and obnoxious aspect when restricted to the description of those valuable factors of the human family who minister to us in our most sacred shrine, the home. If any distinction is to be made among workers, let the highest rank attach to this particular class, since our most precious interests are interwoven with the faithful performance of its duties.

The artisan who saws and planes boards, and drives into them the connecting nail, is a "carpenter;" the man who beautifies woodwork, a "painter;" the grimy but intelligent person who controls mechanism in the production of indispensables, a "machinist;" while among our literary treasures is Longfellow's tribute to yet another honored trade:

"The smith, a mighty man is he,
With large and sinewy hands;
And the muscles of his brawny arms
Are strong as iron bands."

The lady who displays to us a shawl, a roll of muslin, a book, or what not, at a store counter, is entitled a "saleslady;" her sister, who ingeniously contrives headgear for women, a "milliner;" her cousin, who fashions fabrics of silk, or cotton, into neatly-fitting garments, a "dressmaker;" but the lady who invests our dwelling-place—"home, sweet home"—with an air of neatness and comfort, turns a piece of steak to a nicety, bakes for us the wholesome, delicious bread of our grandmothers, and, above all else, cares for our children, is, perforce, a "servant!" True, in some instances household helpers are classed as "cooks," "chambermaids," "nursery-maids," and "ladies' maids;" but, unfortunately, all of these cognomens are grouped under the generic term of "servants." Why?

Whittier's "Maud Muller" is an universal favorite, and the reading world daintily echoes the Judge's opinion:

"A form more fair, a face more sweet,
Ne'er hath it been my lot to meet.

And her modest answer and graceful air
Show her wise and good as she is fair."

But when Miss Muller enters the kitchen the world is disillusioned. The poem tells of the Judge:

"But he thought of his sisters proud and cold,
And his mother vain of her rank and gold.

So, closing his heart, the Judge rode on,
And Maud was left in the field alone."

And in certain social quarters, the moment a girl crosses the threshold of a house as "hired help," she acknowledges therein inferior rank. Shame upon such philosophy! In a word, it is the upas tree of caste, whose deadly shade is steadily creeping over our family life; for the baleful distinctions of rank are unquestionably multiplying and growing more emphatic.

In the parable of Dives and Lazarus we have an impressive delineation of the fixedness of separation which may exist between two individuals. The gulf existed in the terrestrial life, but might then have been bridged by Dives: in the life celestial not even Lazarus, transposed

as he was in respect of preferable location, might traverse the shadowy abyss. In these days the gulf between Dives and Lazarus is widening; and until the former sends the latter something more than the crumbs that fall from his table, and bridges the gulf by those ministries in general which that immortal man of the common people, Abraham Lincoln, termed "the better angels of our nature," the hiatus will remain.

This is not a dissertation upon socialism. The writer has an equal horror of the man, who, occupying a position in which he can use hundreds of his brethren for his own aggrandizement, forgets their monumental share in his achievements, and the thriftless, cunning fellow, who, after securing an equitable division of the world's wealth, and immediately squandering his portion, insists upon a fresh division. But into the sky of our vaunted democracy has come a cloud rather larger than a man's hand. The social customs of monarchical countries have been freely imported; and the republican eye is frequently offended with a flunkeyism analogous to that which prevails abroad, and too often a labored copy of it.

It is humiliating to observe men dressed in conspicuous livery sitting at the front or rear of private carriages under such marvellous restraint of rule that not by the faintest nod may they recognize the existence of their own mothers if they chance to meet them. It causes one to blush for our humanity to reflect on such an incident as the following: A lady who was being temporarily served in a rural retreat, among old-fashioned farmers, by a young schoolmistress, who took her sick sister's place as a mere matter of accommodation to her employer, requested the obliging teacher to wear her hair plainer and cover it with a cap, lest she be mistaken for a member of the family. The refined girl was wearing a dress as modest as that of a Quakeress; but the obvious purpose of the employer was to make clear the deadly distinction in rank.

It is true that caste prevails in every direction; but in no other sphere is it so keenly realized as in domestic service. The world is wide, and many plebeians may play Diogenes with the patricians without danger; but the wholesome spirit of independence cannot easily be indulged in such close contact with the patrician's family.

There are conditions that cannot be simulated, and relationships that cannot be made harmonious at the fiat of a theorist. It is improbable that the Judge would have done wisely to marry Maud Muller. Though he was not contented when

"He wedded a wife of richest dower,
Who lived for fashion, as he for power;"

yet he was doubtless more philosophically situated than if he had obeyed the sudden impulse of his equestrian hour. Notwithstanding the inference conveyed by the poem, that, since the learned man sighed when he thought of "the simple beauty and rustic health" of the meadow maiden, he would have been better off with her as his life's companion, other conditions hinted at indicate that bliss would scarcely have attended the union.

The only concession sought is the elimination of caste from the environment of household service. But this will open the way for a remarkable transformation. Let the profession of housekeeping be put upon the same plane as that of the bookkeeper, telegrapher, typewriter, saleslady, etc., and observe the consequence. It may be that many women who seek mercantile positions are disinclined to the so-called drudgery of housework. If this be true, the necessity of making such work attractive to women in general is all the more apparent, for it goes without saying that every woman should know how to keep house, whatever her profession and whatever her rank. If Maud Muller knew how to cook plain food well, and keep a house tidy, the Judge may be forgiven for his indulgence in day dreams, when he

" . . . closed his eyes on his garnished rooms
To dream of meadows and clover-blooms."

And the concession would probably bring from their country homes many a prize, in the shape of a girl desirous of becoming acquainted with city life, who would prove eminently satisfactory in performing the work of the house, but who would under no circumstances submit to be entitled a "servant;" for there are many Maud Mullers, sweet and sunny in disposition, kindly and good, and reared in homes of the best moral and religious type, who might be secured as assistants in the home, if they could be sure of being measured by the Golden Rule.

But some bewildered reader will exclaim — as a vision of untidiness, not to say absolute slatternliness, rises to her view, or as she imagines with painful vividness that she is breathing the smoky, choking atmosphere of the kitchen after the ruin of a choice bit of broiling meat — "Surely, there are no such girls to be had!" I calmly reply that they are not at all idealistic, but exist corporeally, doing their work intelligently and cheerfully, and conferring blessings upon the families in which they are employed. There are others awaiting engagements, but we would not recommend them to households in which the social ban prevails. "Servants" they will not be, nor can we criticise them therefor.

In the rural districts to which I have alluded a very simple social order prevails. Fine character, attractions of mind and person, an affectionate and uncynical nature — these count for as much in the community in connection with household assistants as they do in the case of the employer. The mistress consults the maid and the maid the mistress, even about personal affairs. As a matter of course, they sit at the same table; ride to church in the same carriage; sit in the same pew; and, as a matter of fact, rank precisely the same. Blissful simplicity! How fortunate society would be if to all the refinement and elegance of the age were universally added the spirit indicated by the lines,

“When Adam dolve, and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?”

Some of the best wives to be found in such sections were once assistants in the homes of their husbands' parents, and were trained by their prospective mothers-in-law. Their excellences were perceived by the eldest sons, and happy matrimony followed. Everybody who has ever visited these parts of the country knows the accomplishments in baking, cooking, and general housekeeping characteristic of their people.

But to look cityward. It is a misfortune that so much of the work in our manufactories falls to the lot of feminine operatives. Home is fundamentally the realm for women; yet, chiefly for the reason set forth in this paper, the clatter and whirr of machinery and the weary monotony of work in a public place are preferred by girls to the secluded quiet of home. Many estimable young ladies are thus engaged who do good service in Sunday-schools and young people's societies. With their intelligence, and natural and cultivable tastes, the training of the household would speedily make them acquisitions.

The atmosphere of our great stores is far from healthful. The breaths of so vast a force of attendants, mingled with those of an army of shoppers, must be very deleterious to all concerned. And yet young women unquestionably prefer such conditions to the delightful environment of a home able to provide the best to be had in all markets. Some of these toilers are perpetually pinched in income, though compelled to dress well; while their slender salaries permit of but cheap lodging and food, unless a father or a brother may be depended upon to furnish a home. Undoubtedly, many of them are disinclined to housework; yet we may safely assume that good food and a good salary, together with such perquisites as the good books and periodicals to be found in certain homes, would tempt many away from mercantile and other public careers, if housework were put upon its proper basis.

Illustration is better than precept. One of the most touching incidents that ever came to the attention of the writer occurred while he was being entertained at the house of a friend. The head of the family was a devout and active church officer. It was his custom to read, each morning, in the presence of the family, a selection from the Bible, and then to offer prayer. When the hour for this exercise approached, the guest was invited into the library, where he noticed the presence of the household helpers. Rising from his chair, the gentleman of the house presented his guest to the assistants, with the simple remark that these were two members of the family whom he had not yet seen. It was a beautiful, brotherly act, and the demeanor of the helpers was a model one. This occurred in a city home.

As a matter of course, in the majority of cases there would be much to learn upon the part of the candidate, and much occasion for patient continuance in well-doing upon the part of the mistress, if the latter were able to impart instruction in housekeeping. In the Housekeeper's Progress — as in that of the Pilgrim — there is many a Hill Difficulty, and many a corresponding Valley of Humiliation. The Plain of Ease is far from spacious, and Doubting Castle lies ever close to Bypath Meadow; but beyond them is the fair and enchanting Land of Beulah, whose blooming gardens and fruitful orchards supply an ample recompense for a dusty and toilsome pilgrimage. However, the ignorant, presumptuous, impudent, brazen persons who sometimes fill household positions, and whose reform can scarcely be hoped for, would soon disappear when unobtrusive, loyal, intelligent, and affectionate helpers could be counted upon. It would be very unjust not to remark that there are many homes of wealth in which the helpers receive fine consideration, and in which much of the discomfort of "the gulf" is smoothed away by kindness and thoughtfulness. But those homes are few indeed in which some evidence of the stigma of servitude, at least its badge, is not recognized. Remove that, and the new era will have dawned.

The maid is the ward of the mistress, and she must share in the homeliness of home, which is the focus of human society. The mistress cannot conscientiously deal with her as if she were purchasing a pound of tea. She cannot evade a certain responsibility growing out of her position. She should clearly know the locality of the home of her maid, and something about the family and its circumstances; and she should take care to inquire courteously from time to time after its health and happiness. It is not necessary for the mistress to confide private matters to her maid, or, *per contra*, for the maid to disclose her

own proper secrets to her mistress. Strangely enough, mistresses have often made their girls confidants in respects most unwise, and have heaped trouble as the result. Such familiarity is fatal, and must be deplored. Yet a good measure of frank and intimate correspondence may be permissible where a sufficiently long acquaintanceship and mutual esteem suggest and prompt it. Still there are matters which should never be ventured upon.

There is really no little responsibility resting upon the employer. It is hers to train her maid in the best aspects of housekeeping, to advise her in the matter of dress and personal appearance, to watch over her friendships, to train her mind, and to help in the development of her moral character. Justice is to be shown in the arrangement of hours of service, and provision made for a proper amount of recreation. Church privileges are to be borne in mind, also occasional mid-week social privileges. If the housekeeper feels appalled at such a vista of duty, it can only be said that this is but an illustration of the obligations that accompany possession. The little whitewashed log cottage on the hillside has few expenses associated with it; but our responsibilities grow in proportion to our acquisitions. It is a day of advance in many respects. There are cooking and sewing schools, and various other institutions for the promotion of household interests. Let the best of these privileges be utilized to the utmost, and their products be brought as tributes to the home.

There is one word of almost magical influence that needs to be whispered in connection with the theme of housekeeping. It is system! Without it, success is doubtful; with it, failure cannot ensue. There must be system for all work, system in hours, system in promptness, system for occupation and system for recreation, system in the rigorous observance of hours of rest and sleep, and system in the hour of rising. When possible, a girl should have in her own right a bright, well-ventilated room, capable of being made comfortable in winter. Attention to this will react in advantage to the employer. Whatever taste the latter expends upon her maid's apartment is an investment sure to result usuriously to herself.

Surely it need not be remarked that a proper supply of food must be provided. And yet there are traditions in some quarters of meagre provision — a feature of which poor and humble homes are guiltless. On the one hand, lessons in extravagance are to be avoided, and, on the other, a pinching diet inadequate to sustain a hard worker. A spoonful of apple-sauce, a thin slice of unbuttered bread, and a cup of tea may be

good diet for an overfed stomach accustomed to all the luxuries of the season, but it will not answer for the sustenance of a busy household assistant.

Where there is but one helper, it becomes imperatively necessary that some share of the work shall rest upon the shoulders of the mistress. It is a regretful feature of very many homes that the wife is overladen with the cares of cooking, baking, sewing, sweeping, and the laundry, together with the nurture of the children. Where it becomes possible to have help, it would certainly be unjust to transfer all these duties to one girl, however willing. The division of household labor will stimulate the maid to her best.

The books, papers, and magazines of the home should, of course, be put within reach of the helpers. The library could be made to renew its vigor, and double its value in this way. The stereoscope, with its variety of instructive and pleasing pictures, would contribute delightfully to their entertainment. A microscope might be brought into requisition; perhaps also a telescope or a spy-glass. When examining any interesting thing, it would be well worth while to cause the helper to share in it also; and in such respects, in the almost numberless instances which come to the surface in the experience of an intelligent family, there will be a host of opportunities of doing good, without which ambition no one can be supremely happy. The books referred to should embrace the best fiction, history, and light science.

The recreation of the summer season of which the family partakes is justly the due of the assistants also. The fascinations of the seashore, where the rolling surf ceaselessly breaks and white sails dot the horizon; the cool haunts in the mountains, from whose summits miles of scenic delights stretch away, tinted with an exquisite blue that finally melts into the azure of heaven; the calm, restful surface of some secluded lake — these are among the educational and soulful benefits that a wealthy person can confer upon his poorer relation. Depend upon it, the results are worth having.

Sympathetic words are to be spoken when painful tidings come from home. The maid may be toiling to support an aged parent or an invalid sister. In such a case, words and deeds should be blended; the grateful relief afforded by loving, judicious expressions being supplemented by the proffer of material help. There is a hurtful gossip that permeates society, which we do well to avoid; but we should not go to the other extreme that disdains to notice the happenings of everyday life among our neighbors. The exhibition of feeling upon the part of the mistress

is not mercenary; nevertheless, it may be abundantly rewarded by devotion and sympathy from the maid. Even among the uncultured helpers are to be found crude Peggottys, whose mother-love for the children impresses them to all time.

The relation of mistress to maid must be, in a word, educative. The ultimate of the training in various departments must be character. The responsibility cannot be evaded without condemnation. It is no light thing at any time to stand at the head of a household. There are helpers who would try the patience of a marble statue, if, indeed, they would not exhaust it. There are mistresses who apparently have no feeling. And yet we are fain to believe that there are very many excellent mistresses and many valuable maids. Some of the former have expressed in deed and word their appreciation of the virtues and faithfulness of their servitors. Many of the latter sing loudly the praises of their kindly mistresses; yet, if we could withdraw the false estimate of rank that has so long interfered with its normal development, and introduce into the realm of household service the infallible principle of the human brotherhood, society would sooner approach the divine climacteric.

What if such fine training should eventuate in attracting the attention of some smart young man of good character and industrious pursuits to a recognition of the worth of the girl just blooming into high usefulness? Let the employer feel that her own service has not been in vain — and rejoice! Let her insist — if her maid be from a far-away home — upon providing a simple, pretty wedding in the home where she has been so faithful. She cannot lose by such sisterhood. It is well to contribute to the enlightenment of distant peoples who know nothing of Christian civilization; but in working by proxy we are deprived of the satisfaction to be found in personal effort at close range. No higher work calls us than just such duties as arise in our own households.

ALDEN W. QUIMBY.

'THE MANILA CENSORSHIP.

FROM June, 1899, to December, 1900, much occurred in the Philippine Islands which was of prime interest to the people of this country, and which it was their right to know. That they were scantily informed on these matters, and that even such information as reached them was garbled and misleading, must be attributed to the military censorship, which continues to be enforced, and which throughout has been absurd and unreasonable. It constituted the great difficulty with which the correspondents of home papers had to contend while in the islands. The difficulties due to climate, sickness, danger, distance, and transportation were of minor importance. Over our heads was an army officer, backed by martial law, who suppressed facts, who demanded to know our sources of information, who delayed the transmission of news, who frequently could not be found except after a search of hours, and who, as a rule, knew less than any one of us what was going on in the Philippines at large. All cable correspondents worked under this censorship, the conditions of which they were for a long time powerless to combat, and the restrictions of which often rendered their best efforts unavailing.

It should be borne in mind here what martial law means. It is applied on the basis that might is right; it is the law which the armed soldier chooses to impose upon the civilian, and from which there is no appeal. Threats that correspondents would be deported from the islands if their actions did not conform to the views of the military were at one time the rule; and while such threats were generally disregarded, yet the power to deport was vested in the military, and no one could know that it would not be exercised. As we had been sent to Manila at heavy expense to transmit news to the United States, deportation would have but poorly served the interests of those at home who were dependent upon us for information.

The experience of a week, or even of a month, with the censorship gave little understanding of its purposes. It was only by coming in contact with its arbitrary exclusions and alterations day after day and year after year, under one governor general after another, that one finally learned the meaning of this military institution. Americans are told,

officially, that in war time it is necessary to maintain such restrictions; and, as a rule, this statement is believed. It is easy to imagine circumstances in which it would be desirable, and even necessary, to prevent certain information, current in the camp, from reaching the enemy. And there is no gainsaying the fact that a military censorship, enforced to prevent the transmission of news valuable to the other side, or likely to "aid and comfort the enemy," is justifiable, though nowadays it is generally futile. But during the year and a half of which I write there was never a time when the news which the censor stopped from going to the United States was not known to all the insurgent Filipinos in Manila, who were in communication with those in the field. Apparently, the Manila censorship was never maintained in accordance with the only justification of a censorship, namely, to keep the enemy in ignorance; but to prevent the people of the United States from being informed of what was happening in the islands; its keynotes being partisan politics and military pride.

I have heard the censorship described as legitimate when it prevented the sending out of news of advance movements of American troops which would inform the enemy of our plans; but I never heard of a reputable correspondent in the Philippines who tried to send out such information. Insurgent observers of American military movements were always well posted concerning our projected expeditions, and this without the aid of news cabled from the United States back to Manila. The supposition that the censorship prevented the insurgents in Manila from communicating with their agents in Hong Kong and elsewhere, is notoriously ridiculous. It utterly failed to accomplish this. The simple subterfuge of a code with two sets of meanings, one for the censor and one for the recipient of the message, made all intercourse with Hong Kong easy. I once saw a message from Hong Kong which stated: "Ammunition afloat." The Chinaman who received this smilingly showed by his code book that the message, when interpreted, meant: "Am sending you by next steamer one thousand duck eggs." In view of the filibustering from the Chinese coast, these words, "Ammunition afloat," more probably meant what they said.

Upon different occasions, the officials of the cable company, who possessed an intimate knowledge of much that happened in Manila, would inform the military authorities that their censorship amounted to nothing, and was constantly evaded by representatives of the rebels. But, notwithstanding these facts, a military censorship over the American people was maintained until after the second election of Mr. Mc-

Kinley. It was removed on November 15, for a few months, only to be re-established later, and it is in force again at the time of writing (April 15). The Manila military authorities never attempted, to the knowledge of the public, to open letters in transit in United States mails; and General MacArthur took to himself much credit for it.

Censors came and censors went. In beginning their work they were uncertain what to let pass, and at first almost every news dispatch was carried to the governor general for his approval. Experience and instruction taught them their duties; and the correspondents themselves soon learned what part of their messages the censors would be likely to exclude or alter. We saw that it was the aim of the censors to prevent the transmission of any news which, directly or indirectly, could be used by the opposition to win votes from the present administration, as well as to stop news which they thought "might alarm the people at home." We also saw that it was their purpose to stop the news of any reverse to American arms, or of the failure of any American military expedition. If it was necessary, for any reason, to allow military news of this kind to pass, it was generally altered to give an impression contrary to the facts. Times without number the censor has dictated a correspondent's dispatch in the terms in which alone he would allow it to go, and this when the facts as set forth by the correspondent were undisputed by the censor himself, who had uninterrupted access to the official reports of the campaign. For example, the use of the word "ambush" was prohibited. This meant that if American troops were ambushed by the enemy, or *vice versa*, we could not relate the occurrence. My continued experience further showed me that any fact or statement of conditions which might reflect upon the doings of the army as a whole, or of any part or member thereof, was distasteful, and could not be sent home if the "interests of the service," from the standpoint of the censor, called for its suppression. The censors considered the army above reproach or criticism.

Political events in the Philippines up to the end of 1900 can be classified, in a general way, under two heads: (1) The doings of our Philippine Civil Commission, which worked with the idea of establishing a general civil government for the Archipelago to supersede eventually the military as the governors of the islands; and (2) the political relations of the army with the Filipino people. In the first case, the army censors never dared to interfere with the news of the Commission's doings, purposes, or ideas. Information of this nature was always passed, although it could be plainly seen that the censor would have liked to

stop any news message which tended to explain to the people at home, directly or indirectly, that the Commission would eventually deprive the army of the civil control of Philippine affairs. No such restraint existed with respect to political news emanating otherwise than directly from the Commission.

News of the army's efforts at political dealings with the Filipinos was stopped if the army had not been successful in its undertakings. Notable among examples of this kind was the Pedro Paterno incident. In July, 1900, General MacArthur tried to organize a peace movement among the Filipino people through the instrumentality of Pedro Paterno. It was subsequently found that Paterno represented this movement to his people as nothing other than the granting of Filipino independence, as a result of his own efforts with the American authorities. He succeeded in fooling the Americans until the last moment, and the whole thing resulted in a fiasco. The outcome of this scheme reflected upon the judgment of General MacArthur, and he would not permit the facts in the case to be sent out. A similar case was the failure of the native judges of Manila to fulfil their duties honestly. They were notoriously corrupt, and their justice was a parody. The records of the provost marshal's office were filled with proofs of this state of affairs; but these judges had been placed in office, fathered, and vouched for by the military authorities, who declined to take notice of their notorious shortcomings. Even when one of these natives was suspended from office under the charge of being a party to a scheme to defraud, no news of the matter was allowed to go forth.

The military authorities never defined their position with respect to the censorship. They would never even faintly indicate what news might, or might not, be transmitted to the United States. They reserved the right to suppress anything they saw fit, without precedent or reason, and without explanation. Such an attitude worked a much greater hardship when applied to the local press than it did to the correspondents of home papers. In former days Spain had maintained an official to whom all proofs of local newspapers could be submitted. This official had regular hours of consultation daily, and would decide at once respecting the acceptability of any article shown to him. The American authorities never established such an office, though they were repeatedly asked to do so; neither would they set forth what might, or might not, be published in the Manila newspapers. They contented themselves with threats of fines, imprisonment, and confiscation of plant, in case any matter not acceptable to themselves was printed.

They also suppressed innumerable news dispatches addressed from outside points to Manila newspapers. This action was, of course, legitimate when the news thus suppressed endangered the local situation. But they declined to reimburse the local newspapers for the cable tolls paid on these suppressed messages. Even Spain, poor as she was, had never failed to pay the tolls due on messages suppressed by her representatives. There is in existence an International Telegraphic Convention, established to formulate the details of the transmission of telegraphic messages between nations. Article No. 7 of this convention sets forth that the governments agreeing to the terms of this convention may stop the transmission of any message which may appear dangerous to the security of the state. Regulation No. 73 of this same convention says:

"When a telegram is stopped under article No. 7 of the convention, the charge made for transmission is returned to the sender, and the refund is borne by the administration which stopped the telegram."

The International Telegraphic Convention is signed by practically every nation of consequence, the United States excepted. Our own country, as a government, has never had any international telegraphic obligations. The terms of the convention are also accepted by all private companies which do international telegraphic business. Yet the authorities in Manila persistently refused to recognize the claims of senders of suppressed messages for the refund of cable tolls; and communications on the matter were pigeonholed and ignored. Six months ago nearly every paper in Manila had claims against the military authorities, for amounts ranging from \$500 to \$1,500 (Mexican), arising from sums paid for the transmission of suppressed messages..

It has been interesting to note how both Washington and Manila have disavowed responsibility for the censorship. Washington announced that it was maintained solely because the military commander of the Philippines found it to be a military exigency; while the military commander at Manila declared that he was ready and anxious to abolish it, but was prevented by the fact that Washington insisted upon its maintenance. Upon several occasions Washington promised certain American newspapers, which had correspondents in the Philippines, that the censorship would be mitigated or removed at once; but these were but empty promises. With respect to the attitude of Washington on the Manila censorship, there may be quoted the well-known instance when General Corbin announced in the American press, on October 10, 1899, that this censorship had been removed. This statement was generally

believed by the public, but it was absolutely unfounded. When questioned, on February 21, 1900, respecting this alleged removal, Captain H. A. Greene, of the Twentieth Infantry, then a member of General Otis' staff, and acting as censor, said, in writing:

"Nothing is known in this office concerning American newspaper statement that the press censorship in the Philippines has been removed. The censorship continues under War Department instructions."

The censorship caused daily delay in the transmission of news. The censor had irregular office hours, and did not understand that a civilian might want to send a cable message when the censor did not choose to be available. The military authorities failed to realize that the fact of arbitrarily imposing a restriction on the free use of such an important feature of modern life as telegraphic communication carried with it an obligation to the general public to facilitate the use of the cable under the restrictions enforced. The military governor never appointed more than one officer to act as censor at the same time; and, from the standpoint of the gentleman so appointed, he could hardly be expected to remain on duty at a given place for eighteen or twenty hours a day. I once arrived at a censor's office, with a dispatch to be censored, at one minute after half-past five, the hour at which he went home, only to have him refuse to look at my message until eight o'clock; and then my interview had to take place at his residence, two miles away. Another officer, who was made censor under General MacArthur, announced that his office hours were from ten until twelve in the morning, and from two until four in the afternoon. When asked where he could be found outside of office hours, he replied that he could not tell; that he might be at home, that he might be driving about the city, or that he might be with friends. The censor's restrictions on the use of the cable were not enforced upon press correspondents alone. With the exception of a few exempted firms, any private citizen, business man, or merchant of Manila, if cabling on personal affairs, must have his message looked over. Once, when a censor was indisposed, I saw the commercial cable business of the Philippines, both incoming and outgoing, delayed and stalled for sixty hours, because the authorities had not appointed a substitute to act in his place. Upon this occasion the newspaper correspondents represented that their messages could not be thus delayed, with the result that a temporary censor was appointed to deal with press dispatches only. While the officer above referred to held the position, Manila could receive and send messages for four hours a day only; and even during these limited hours the censor would frequently be absent from

his office. Time and again I reached that gentleman's office, when he should still have been on duty, only to find that he had elected to go driving. Then, in order to get a message through, I had to search the whole town to find him. On Sundays he was often entirely out of reach. He naturally considered Sunday a day of rest and recreation, and was inclined to resent the intrusion of a man with messages. The general impression prevailed among the military that news was just as good if sent some time the next day.

Every message had to be initialled as O.K. before the cable company would accept it for transmission. The censor, as a military officer attached to the staff of the commanding general, was often anxious to be informed concerning the sources from which the information contained in a news message was derived. It was manifestly impossible to divulge to the commanding general the names of those American officers, or Filipinos for that matter, who had supplied the correspondent with his information. If we had made a practice of so doing, we should have gathered very little news. The commanding generals frequently ordered officers not to give news to correspondents; and army officers have been reprimanded for the supposed infringement of this order. I recall a piece of news which emanated from the headquarters of the late General Lawton. This was submitted to the censor, who at once informed General Otis of the contents of the message. The officers attached to the headquarters whence the news in question had emanated were so severely taken to task by the commanding general that for days afterward that source of information was sealed.

The censor was generally well posted on military happenings throughout the islands; but he was apt to be ignorant on matters outside his particular province — on religious, political, and other affairs, for instance. I have had messages suppressed because the censor was not informed concerning what I said. He did not question my statement: he simply knew nothing about it. Or he would hold my dispatch up until he could inquire concerning that particular subject, or until he had a chance to submit it to his superior officer, the commanding general. This practice accounted for many delays. A correspondent would often spend time and money and undergo hardships in obtaining good and exclusive news, only to have it refused. He would then have to wait for permission to file; and by the time this was granted, the story, in all probability, had become common property, had been printed in the local press, and was in the hands of the other press representatives. Several successive experiences like the foregoing discouraged one's efforts to do

good work.. I have had messages delayed for forty eight hours, until official communications on the same subject had been forwarded to Washington. Upon one occasion I was thus delayed for three days, and was assured that I could file after the official message had been sent. After waiting until this was done, I was told that I could send nothing at all on the matter in question, which was the capture, by the insurgents, of Marinduque Island and of fifty-one men of Company F, Twenty-ninth Volunteer Infantry, under the command of Captain Shields. The authenticity of my news on this subject was never questioned, although headquarters refused to confirm it, even after official dispatches had been received corroborating the incident.

The time required for the transmission of a message from Manila to New York, after it had passed and had been filed, varied several hours, and could never be known beforehand. According to the cable company, seven hours suffice for such transit; but experience has shown me that it generally takes a news message of a hundred words or more ten or twelve hours to get from Manila to New York. Manila is, roughly speaking, thirteen hours ahead of New York time. In other words, when it is day in Manila, it is the night before in New York. If a dispatch is filed between 5 and 7 p.m. in Manila, it is then between 4 and 6 a.m. of the same day in New York. Add to this New York time ten or twelve hours for the transmission of the message, and you get the hour of arrival here. This brings a 7 o'clock dispatch from Manila to New York at about 5 p.m., or two hours before it is filed. Most of the news in the Philippines, as elsewhere, occurs during the day, and is put on the wires in the evening or at night. More dispatches were, of necessity, put on the wire at Manila between the hours of 5 and midnight than during any other period of the day; consequently, most news dispatches were received by the New York newspapers between the hours of 3 p.m. and midnight. I have risen at 5 or 6 a.m. with news gathered late the night before, and have ridden five miles to the cable office, calculating and hoping to get the matter over in ample time for afternoon editions. I may have succeeded, but it was impossible to tell; it was always hitting in the dark.

A message between Manila and New York undergoes thirteen relays; that is to say, it is taken off and put on the wire again thirteen times. This is often done at the relay points by native operators, whose knowledge of English is confined to dots and dashes. This increases the chances of a message being received in an incomprehensible form, with consequent delay in deciphering it. Press messages relating to the

Boer war and the trouble in China were considered by the operators to be of greater interest to the general public than Manila news; and at Singapore and Hong Kong news from South Africa and China was often placed ahead of waiting Manila dispatches.

On the cable everything takes precedence over press messages, which are never sent until the station where they are filed is entirely clear of other business. This process is repeated at every station on the line. Government messages have precedence on the wire over all other matter; then come "urgent messages," paid for, from Manila, at the rate of seven dollars a word; then commercial or full rate messages; and lastly press news. Even then press matter costs seventy-seven cents a word from Manila. Urgent messages will come through in from two to three hours; but the price prohibits their use except for the most important bulletins.

The Manila censorship was brought to a temporary close in the following way: On October 11, 1900, I received this cablegram from my office, "Is censorship reasonable now? Answer." This message was handed to me by the censor, with the comment that it was a difficult question for me to reply to. I asked him if he would permit me to send an uncensored reply to this query, citing as a precedent the fact that a predecessor had permitted an uncensored answer to an identical question received during his censorship. He replied that inasmuch as the military authorities did not consider the censorship to be unreasonable, they would not permit me to characterize it as such, and that my answer must be submitted to him. Accordingly, I prepared a careful reply, in which I said that the censorship was unreasonable; that my news was often delayed from twenty-four to forty-eight hours; that I was prohibited from sending in established facts as such; and that the censor altered statements of facts and occurrences. I was sure of every statement contained in this answer, and I could easily substantiate every qualification. I submitted this message to the censor, who at once took it to General MacArthur. The latter sent me word that my dispatch was untrue and misleading, but that, if I persisted, he would permit me to transmit it. I sent the message, adding that while General MacArthur characterized it as untrue and misleading, he still permitted it to go. Forty-eight hours after this message was filed, the censor who took the message to General MacArthur was suddenly removed from his post and transferred to the staff of General Bates.

On Sunday, October 21, the new censor told me that a cable message had been received from my office, but that, owing to its contents,

General MacArthur was undecided whether or not to permit me to see it. Later on the same day this message was given to me. It read: "Secretary Root assures me the censorship will be removed immediately." I waited three days, and then cabled: "Censorship unchanged." In the meantime another censor had been appointed. On November 14, the latter informed me that the Manila censorship would be removed the next day. I asked whether this removal followed instructions from Washington, and was told, with some heat, that it did not matter where the order originated. Then, in easier tones, I was informed that some months previously General MacArthur had recommended the abolition of the Manila censorship, and that this step was now taken in compliance with his suggestion. The next day the censorship on press dispatches between Manila and the United States was, for the time being, abolished. At the same time the cable company at Manila was instructed to hand every evening to the military governor copies of all press dispatches filed that day. The censorship on press or commercial cablegrams between points in the Philippine Islands themselves, and between Manila and points in Europe, was never removed.

A few words may be added with respect to the cable route from Hong Kong, which is three or four days by steamer from Manila. Messages could have been mailed from Manila to Hong Kong and there filed; thus avoiding the Manila censorship. This was often done; but such an evasion of their jurisdiction was offensive to the military authorities; and no one correspondent could afford, in view of the strong competition in news gathering, to offend the ruling powers. Hence Hong Kong was used only when necessary. Mailing to Hong Kong meant a delay of at least three days; and with one's rivals filing news from Manila, under the censor, as best they could, the exclusive use of Hong Kong as a starting-point was impossible.

A censor's ruling was absolute, and an appeal could only be made to the commanding general, who always sustained his subordinate. It was only when the matter of the censorship was vigorously taken up at Washington that Manila realized it could not always act without consideration of the interests and rights of the American press.

The system of censorship described in this article again became operative at Manila, under General MacArthur, in the spring of the present year.

HAROLD MARTIN.

AN AMERICAN VIEW OF THE BRITISH INDUSTRIAL SITUATION.

AMERICANS with the protective bias have been observing with keen interest the trend of industrial events in Great Britain, because they are convinced that the economic policy adhered to by that country is on trial, and that the result will be sure to discredit many, if not all, of the theories of those who have advocated complete freedom of trade. It is possible, therefore, that one who approaches the subject from the standpoint of opposition to Cobdenism may say something that may be of use in the present discussion of the commercial future of the United Kingdom.

In all the articles on the subject which have come under my observation in British reviews and newspapers, I have noted that the writers apparently fear to attack the problem fairly and squarely. Even "Calchas," who does not hesitate in his remarkable contribution to the January "Fortnightly" to declare that it is only a question of whether Great Britain can maintain second place in the commercial race, and who does not shrink from admitting that free trade does not always work well in practice, insists that "the soundness of the abstract economics" of the Manchester school cannot be disputed. If British writers could be induced to dismiss the idea that the doctrine of free trade is impregnable, it might be possible for them to avoid arguing in a circle. That is what they are now doing. "Calchas" and all who like him are able to stare the situation in the face, and who frankly confess that the Cobden dream of making Great Britain the world's workshop must be dismissed by Britons, in their efforts to suggest remedies to avert what they regard as a great evil, invariably make recommendations which are based on the assumption that the British are naturally better fitted for manufacturing than other people.

This may seem like a baseless charge to those who are familiar with the contents of the article, "Will England Last the Century?" in which the writer above mentioned emphasizes a view recently expressed by Count von Posadowski Wehner, the German Secretary for the Interior,

who declared that it was the tendency of all civilized peoples to aim at self-sufficiency. "Calchas" says:

"All over the progressive world the textile mills and ironworks of our competitors will be followed by their shipyards and their shipping. They will deal more and more directly with each other instead of through us. We have reached our limit. England can be but one among the workshops, the warehouses, and the transport managers of the earth."

Here is a plain admission of the complete breakdown of the Cobden idea; but "Calchas," owing to the tremendous influence of the prevalent British belief that "the correctness of the abstract economics of free trade cannot be disputed," is unable to recommend any other course of action than the one which has been steadily adhered to by the United Kingdom ever since her inhabitants became convinced that they were better adapted to the pursuit of manufacturing than most, if not all, other peoples.

If the British were as practical as they claim to be they would abandon all attempts to achieve the impossible. But they are not. According to the admissions of many competent observers they are worshippers of a fetich. They allowed themselves to be deluded by the teachings of a school of economists, whose theories have been utterly discredited by events; and they fear to stultify themselves by abandoning a doctrine which they once implicitly believed in, but now have their doubts about. Their writers talk contemptuously about the Chinese peculiarity which demands that "face" be saved; but they go to still greater extremes and refuse to correct an error, even though the correction may accentuate an impression which has universally prevailed until very recently, that no people in ancient or modern times ever made such excellent use of their advantages as those inhabiting the British Isles.

If it is impossible to make Great Britain the world's workshop, it ought to be evident to those Britons who now admit this that the right thing for Britain to do would be to abandon that portion of her trade policy which was especially designed to accomplish the object which has confessedly failed. Free trade proceeded on the theory that the people of countries with large resources in the shape of raw materials and food-stuffs would find it profitable to exchange them for British manufactured goods. It is idle to discuss the question whether the theory was sound. It is no longer a question of theories, but one of conditions. The peoples who were expected to confine themselves to the rôle of producers of food-stuffs and raw materials have refused to accept their place in the cast. They have read their Adam Smith with diligence, and are disinclined to

engage in a business which he plainly says is unprofitable, that of exchanging a great quantity of the rude products of the soil for a very small quantity of manufactured articles. They are all anxious to play leading parts, and insist upon being manufacturing Hamlets or Richards, so that they may occupy the centre of the economic and political stage.

This fact is too apparent to be disputed. There is not a civilized people on the face of the globe that does not aim at self-sufficiency; and some that we are accustomed to look upon as only semi-civilized feel the stir of this desire. The procession of events marches rapidly in these days. The barbarian of yesterday may be a civilized man to-morrow. Fifty years ago Western nations forced Japan to open her ports to the outside world. A quarter of a century hence the people of the rest of the world may be casting about for means to prevent an industrial invasion of their ports by the Japanese. To-day Europeans and Americans are eager to teach the Chinese their habits, so that they may learn to consume the surplus products of Western workshops. To-morrow we may be studying how to prevent the adaptive Chinese from flooding our markets with manufactured goods. If we could persuade the Chinese, the Japanese, and the other peoples upon whom we desire to unload our surpluses, that the proper thing for them to do would be to confine themselves to producing those commodities which we need, and which do not come into competition with the articles we wish to sell them, all would be well. But, unfortunately, all peoples seem to be tarred with the same economic brush. The love of a good thing is not confined to Western peoples. The profits of manufacturing present as many allurements to the Oriental mind as to the Occidental. Japanese efforts and progress in various modern industries testify to this; and the facility and success with which the Chinese have taken hold of manufacturing in California indicate what will happen when Western ideas and habits are once fairly introduced into China.

The outlook for a considerable expansion of external trade being so unpromising, it would seem that the right thing for Britons to do would be to recognize the situation and to cast about for other methods of utilizing their surplus energies. If the world refuses to permit Great Britain to become its workshop, there is no good reason why Great Britain should not remain her own workshop, or, to put the matter more accurately, why she should not regain an advantage she has temporarily parted with while making the vain effort to establish a permanent commercial supremacy. It is to the accomplishment of this that the best British thought should be directed; and American protectionists are confident

that this will occur as soon as the statesmen and publicists of the United Kingdom cease to pay deference to a theory and elevate practical considerations to the first place. Cobdenism has converted Englishmen into sentimentalists, and has made them attach more importance to the showings of tables of exports and imports than to essentials. The followers of the Manchester school have so accustomed themselves to regard trade as of more importance than production that they have quite overlooked the possibility that a proper encouragement of the latter may result in expanding the former. Their action suggests the fable of the dog who lost his breakfast in attempting to snatch the reflection in the water of the bone he carried in his mouth.

The inhabitants of the British Isles now number over 41,000,000. They have developed the ability to consume to a higher degree than all other peoples except Americans. Their power to do this, however, depends largely upon their ability to produce, not for export, as some seem to think, but for domestic consumption. In order to continue the present volume of production, it is not necessary that Britons should produce as cheaply as other peoples. They may largely increase the output of their mines and farms, and yet the products of both may be produced at a greater apparent cost than similar things are by the people of other nations. Experience has demonstrated that this is true. It has shown that the Americans were able to increase their production during a long period in which the cost of the things produced exceeded that of other countries. The explanation is simple. It is due to the operation of a law the existence of which the free traders have deliberately ignored, namely, that of the stimulus of self-dependence. When American legislators, by their protective tariffs, virtually made foreign goods of a certain character too dear to be purchased, they said in effect to the people of the United States: If you want these things you must make them for yourselves. As the American people had been educated along lines which made their desires practically unlimited, they at once set to work to satisfy them, with the result testified to by "Calchas" and others, when they cite the fact that the output of steel and iron and other products gives the United States a foremost position in the ranks of producers.

It goes without saying that the consumptive desire is as active in the United Kingdom as in the United States, and that it will continue to exist as long as British legislators will permit it to operate. It can only do so by keeping the great majority of the 41,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom at work productively. If, through the tariff legislation of foreign countries, it becomes more and more difficult and

at length impossible to employ profitably the millions of operatives in British mills and workshops in manufacturing for the outside world, then the people of the United Kingdom must turn to and manufacture for themselves. The condition that will then ensue will not differ very materially from that which constantly arises in the vast territorial area of the United States, where the proprietors of the soil are frequently obliged, and with profit to themselves, to change their mode of cultivation. In many parts of the Eastern States of the American Union it has ceased to be possible to raise the cereals in competition with the West; but, except in rare cases, that has not caused the land to be thrown out of cultivation. On the contrary, it has resulted in a compulsory diversification of the agricultural industry; and highly remunerative fruit and truck farming has taken the place of the less profitable cropping of the commoner grains.

It may be urged that this illustration does not present a real analogy; that the resources of the British Isles will not permit any "pent-up Utica"; that, in short, to put it as baldly as "Calchas" does, if Great Britain cannot keep her external trade, she cannot keep her empire and her population. There is a confusion of ideas, however, in this latter assumption, and it is due to the fact that "Calchas" thinks that the fortunes of the people of the British Isles are wholly dependent upon the maintenance of the empire. It is conceivable that Great Britain could remain a powerful nation if shorn of several million square miles of the territory over which the Union Jack now floats. It is even thinkable that, divested of part of this tremendous area, which is a greater source of expense than of revenue, the United Kingdom might be in a better position not only for defence, but to strike, than she is at present. Not many years ago the Manchester school of economists taught, and the majority of the British people acquiesced in the teaching, that it would be the part of wisdom to help the colonists to prepare themselves thoroughly for self-government, and then permit them to set up for themselves. Although this belief was the result of the conviction that the universal adoption of free trade would render Great Britain commercially impregnable, there was underlying it a knowledge of the fact that the maintenance of a great empire upon the conditions which the British had imposed upon themselves would prove enormously costly and a source of vulnerability.

Before attempting to present the evidence that the expansion of the British empire along the lines now followed is proving a source of weakness rather than of strength, it will be well to set out the American pro-

tectionist view of the possibility of Great Britain increasing her productivity and wealth, and consequently her real power. This view is based on observation of the fact that the people of the United Kingdom are becoming more and more addicted to the unnecessary habit of depending upon foreigners for things which they might with profit produce for themselves. I do not mean by this that they are importing articles from abroad which, under present conditions, could be produced more cheaply at home. Price lists would promptly expose the folly of such a contention. But I do contend that there are many branches of manufacture and agriculture now wholly or comparatively neglected, which, with proper encouragement, could be made to flourish. The proof is abundant that if such a course were pursued it would make the products really cheaper and more accessible to the British people, although they might nominally appear to be dearer.

An illustration is furnished by the growth of the silk manufacturing industry in the United States. Under the influence of a stiff protective tariff it has developed to great proportions; the value of the product of American silk textile factories now being in excess of that of the entire output of the manufactories of France. The entire American product of silken fabrics is consumed at home; and although the prices may nominally range higher than in free-trade England, it is a significant fact that the working people in the United States are not strangers to the use of silk textiles. The shop girl, the feminine domestic, or the female factory operative in the United States who is not the possessor of one or more garments of silk may be set down as exceptionally thrifty or destitute of the ambition to shine in the eyes of her associates. There are few such in America.

Investigating the history of this industry in the United Kingdom, we find that at one time it was in a most flourishing condition, but that since, under the pressure of foreign competition, it has shrunk to comparatively insignificant proportions. In 1857, according to Mulhall's "Industries and Wealth of Nations," the British consumption of raw silk was 10,750,000 pounds, and the value of silk fabrics produced in the same year is given by the same authority at £21,500,000. Thirty-four years earlier, in 1823, the consumption of raw silk by the factories of the United Kingdom was only 2,470,000 pounds. A great part of the increase of production which these figures imply was during the period before the abrogation of the corn laws. In 1898 the imports of raw silk into Great Britain aggregated 2,138,912 pounds, being 331,088 pounds less than in 1823. The tremendous diminution of production after

1857 was not due to a declining taste for silk goods; for in 1898 there were imported into the United Kingdom broad stuffs, ribbons, and other manufactures of silk to the amount of \$83,116,150. The vast quantity these figures represent and the silk goods domestically produced were almost wholly consumed by the people of the British Isles, as the value of the exports and re-exports of silk manufactures reached the insignificant amount of \$12,025,920 only, of which the sum of \$4,381,110 belongs in the latter category.

The story of the decline of British silk manufacturing is not the only one that may be told; but it is by far the most forceful, because its details can be contrasted with those of the growth and prosperity of the industry in another country which, like Great Britain, is compelled to import its raw material. The factories of the United States work up raw silk brought under disadvantageous circumstances from far-away lands; but they have been producing the finished fabrics in constantly increasing quantity and notable improvement of quality, until now it is estimated that the output exceeds that of France. It is even difficult to suggest a reason why the British silk industry could not have held its own if it had been similarly encouraged; and, I believe, no American protectionist, with all the arguments in favor of free trade in his mind, can be persuaded that Great Britain would not have vastly benefited by holding fast that which the enterprise and ingenuity of her working people had secured for her. When the British silk industry was exposed to the competition of peoples whose standard of living was much lower than that which prosperity had created for the workingman of the United Kingdom, it held a commanding position which it could easily have maintained. It was needlessly sacrificed to a theory.

Unless the people of Great Britain abandon this theory, they must prepare to see other industries share the fate of that whose history has just been cited. A glance at the table of British imports for the year 1898 discloses that greater or less quantities of the following classes of manufactured articles were bought from foreigners and consumed by the people of the United Kingdom: Books, maps and charts, buttons and studs, candles, caoutchouc, chemicals, china, porcelain and earthenware, clocks, cocoa and chocolate, confectionery, cordage, corks, cotton-yarns, cotton piece goods, etc., embroideries, glass bottles and other glass, hair and goat's wool, hardware and cutlery, ice, jute, lace and articles thereof, leather, boots and shoes, gloves, linen yarns and manufactures of linen, matches, iron, steel and machinery, zinc, musical instruments, paper and manufactures of paper, paraffin, pictures and drawings, sew-

ing machines, silk manufactures, fur garments, etc., straw plaiting, sugar (refined) and candy, tobacco, manufactures of tobacco, toys, matches, house framings and cabinet work, woodware and turnery, woollens, yarns, yeast, etc. In 1898 the importations of these articles totalled over £107,000,000. There were also imported food-stuffs of various kinds valued at about £126,000,000. The remainder of the imports during the year may be roughly set down as raw materials. Their stated value was in the neighborhood of £245,000,000, or about £12,000,000 more than the combined values of imports of manufactures and food-stuffs.

I have enumerated the classes of manufactured articles imported into Great Britain, and have referred to the imports of food-stuffs in the same connection, for the purpose of emphasizing as strongly as possible the belief entertained by most protectionists that a very large portion of the imports of this character, aggregating nearly £233,000,000, would, with proper encouragement, be produced by British artisans and agriculturists. They fail to produce them at present not because they are less skilful, or because the resources of the United Kingdom will not permit of their production in that country, but chiefly because the foreigners who export to Great Britain are resorting to methods which permit them to maintain prices at home by dumping their surpluses on the one country which still consents to be made the victim of the practice. Lord Rosebery, in his speech before the Wolverhampton Chamber of Commerce, delivered on January 16 last, treated this as a comparatively new device, and credited Americans with its origination. He is in error. Many years ago his own countrymen deliberately resorted to the method, and were instigated to that course by Lord Brougham, who, in 1815, publicly urged that it would well be worth the while of British manufacturers and merchants to

“incur loss upon the first exportation, in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle these rising manufactures in the United States which the war has forced into existence contrary to the natural course of things.”

It is not necessary, however, to fix the date of the beginning of the practice, or to inquire closely into the motives which have prompted it, or to ask ourselves whether the world would be better off if it were abandoned. So far as this inquiry is concerned, the only thing to determine is whether it is working injuriously to Great Britain, and, if so, whether any remedy can be successfully applied. It appears to be generally admitted that the United Kingdom is a serious sufferer by the system of forcing exports to which foreigners have resorted. Those who are curious regarding the details may find a great deal of information in the

articles contributed by Mr. J. Stephen Jeans to "Engineering," in which he describes the results of what he terms "high organization" in Germany and the United States, and in which he rather lamely concludes that "in so far as Germany or any other country sells in neutral markets at less than cost, it is not fair competition." But Mr. Jeans quite overlooks the fact that there is no such thing as fair competition in trade. There is not a manufacturer in the United Kingdom or any other country who would not undersell his rival at the expense of a present loss if he foresaw a future gain from the process. It is the common custom to dispose of surplus stocks without reference to their cost of production. In the United States this was done for many years in a bungling fashion; but a leaf was taken out of the history of British experience, and American manufacturers now seek to market their surpluses without breaking home prices. They learned the bitter lesson that the surplus when dumped on the domestic market fixes the price, without reference to the cost of the product; and they have governed themselves accordingly. Mr. Jeans says that this dumping of surpluses

"could be effectively met only by the adoption elsewhere of a similar economic system which, however, cannot be looked for in England, wedded as she is to free trade, whatever consequences that system may involve."¹

If this is true, then all the discussion of the situation which fills the pages of the reviews and the columns of the daily press of Great Britain is wasted; for nothing is more certain than the fact that the British, if they wish to hold their own in the commercial race, must adopt the methods of other manufacturing nations. An earthenware vessel runs great risk of being broken when set afloat on a pond in which brass ones are swimming. From the standpoint of the free trader, the methods of such nations as Germany and the United States may be regarded as offensively brazen; but if brazenness is to prove the winning quality in the commercial race, those who have adopted potsherds must abandon them if they wish to win. Armor of the latter kind will prove too brittle for offensive or defensive purposes in the fierce clash of overproduction which the future is sure to witness as a result of that tendency toward self-sufficiency which is so marked a feature of modern times.

Lord Rosebery, when speaking of the possible effects upon the industries of Great Britain of this forcing-out system, remarked that it was a danger which the country could not afford to disregard. He thus suggested the gravity of the situation by an illustration:

"Suppose a trust of many millions, of a few men combined so as to compete

¹ "Engineering Magazine," December, 1897.

with any trade in this country [Great Britain] by underselling all its products, even at a considerable loss to themselves, and we can see in that what are the possibilities of the commercial outcome of the immediate future."

The illustration was pertinent enough, but it was weakened by assuming that the difficulty was increased by the accumulation of great fortunes in the hands of a few men. The contributions of the many to joint stock enterprises are manipulated as effectively as the capital of successful Carnegies. A great "trust" or industry, the shares of which may be held by thousands, is just as likely to pursue the deprecated course as a combination of "a few men." It is the dumping, not the manner of the act or by whom it is done, that concerns the people of the United Kingdom. It can make no difference to them whether their manufacturers are undersold by a single foreigner who owns a plant worth many millions, or whether the underselling is done by a great foreign plant, the capital for which was furnished by several thousand subscribers. To inveigh against trusts in such a connection is to cross the trail with a red herring: it necessarily results in diverting the pursuer from the track of truth. In like manner, the emphasis laid upon the need of better education, and upon the shortcomings, real or fancied, of British workingmen, has a tendency to disguise the facts, and thus to make it impossible to find an effective remedy.

The malady from which Great Britain is suffering is her open ports, or, perhaps, it would be better to say that these have promoted it. They were thrown open on the assumption that certain healthful results would follow. The expectation has been disappointed. The most important one, namely, that other nations would imitate British example, has not occurred. On the contrary, the opposite course has been pursued. Instead of opening their ports freely to the British, rival peoples have deliberately framed tariffs which have had the effect of making it difficult for the manufacturers of the United Kingdom to market their surplus productions, and, at the same time, have resorted to methods which seem to be effectually displacing British wares in the British Isles. The foreigners may be pursuing uneconomic methods, as the Cobdenites assert, or promoting the best interests of their countries, as protectionists assume; but in either case the fact remains that Great Britain is playing a losing game. Indeed, she is doing the uncommercial thing of persistently giving something for nothing — a line of action which, in the long run, must result in disaster.

I am not disregarding the free-trade argument that the gain to Great Britain comes in the form of cheap things for consumption, nor am I

disposed to ignore the evidence to which Cobdenites point with pride to justify their position. On the contrary, protectionists will cite the tremendous increase of imports into Great Britain as positive proof of the untenableness of the theory that a nation can afford to continue indefinitely a policy the effect of which is to encourage foreign at the expense of domestic production. They point to the fact that the rivals of Great Britain are successfully assailing, one after another, the industries upon which she relies for her prosperity; and they refer to the details of the tables of exports and imports to expose the fallacy of the belief that a people can easily readapt itself to the conditions created by the unrestrained competition of foreigners. If there were any foundation for this latter assumption, the concern which daily finds expression regarding the industrial future of the United Kingdom would be absent; and it would be unnecessary for publicists to rack their minds to find a cause for an admittedly bad state of affairs, or to propose remedies all of which are essentially as protective in character as duties avowedly levied on imports for that purpose.

If the Cobden theory were sound, the British people, whenever they should be driven out of one branch of manufacturing, would have no occasion for uneasiness. All they would have to do would be to turn to others. But it is not. There is a fatal flaw in it. It will not work in practice, because the people of other nations insist upon entering every avenue of industry. There is no disposition to accept the doctrine that one nation is especially fitted to carry on profitably a certain kind of industry, while others pursue different ones because they are adapted to them. All-aroundness, or, as the German Secretary for the Interior puts it, "self-sufficiency" is the order of the day; and it prevents Cobdenism from developing into a universal system.

The result of the refusal of the world to accept free trade is overproduction; but this is not an unmixed evil. It certainly contributes to the end which Cobdenites professed to aim at. There is no doubt that it tends to that real cheapness which is indicated by the enlarged ability to consume. This hardly admits of argument. If, owing to artificial stimulus, the production of iron is increased fourfold during a period in which the consuming population has scarcely doubled, then there is a distinct gain which can be directly traced to the putting forth of energies which would have otherwise lain dormant. Evils may exist concurrently with the greatly increased production; but they cannot be attributed to the system which stimulates production; they must be set down to other causes. If a crowd in its eagerness to get at the contents of an overflowing gran-

ary tramples out a few lives, it will not be charged that the farmers who produced the grain are to blame for exerting themselves to fill the storehouse with the products of their fields and toil. No more can protection be held responsible for the shortcomings of the modern distributive system. Its primary aim is to promote production, and thereby increase the national wealth. If it accomplishes this it justifies itself; and it is illogical either to denounce it, or to ask that the system be abandoned, because modern legislators or economists have not found themselves equal to the task of devising means to absorb the increased production.

It must be obvious that whether the protectionist view is sound or unsound, no argument can be presented which will induce the nations which have adopted the policy to abandon it. That is now impossible. As the years go on, the tendency which Lord Rosebery deprecates will increase rather than diminish. There will be a constant effort to get rid of the surplus productions of a country without sacrificing the producers. The idea is now generally entertained by workingmen in the United States, and it is shared in by those of Germany, that excessive competition in the home market is destructive to domestic industry. The opinion of Mr. Jeans, that the effect of organization is "to make the home business so profitable that manufacturers can afford, if necessary, to lose on export orders," and thereby "build up trade and keep their manufacturing establishments and their workingmen fully employed," is now accepted by a great majority of those who control affairs in the United States and Germany. This being the case, Great Britain must adapt herself to the new conditions, or she will go to the wall. It is idle to talk about fair competition. Under the circumstances there can be none.

Again, if matters cannot be so adjusted that the contest will be one in which skill and aptitude determine the result, it must be a mistake to lay stress on increased education as a remedy. A people cannot be too well educated; but if it were possible for the British by improving their educational processes to raise the standard of skill and efficiency of their workingmen and merchants higher than that of the Germans and Americans, they would still be unable to compete with the latter in the domestic markets of Great Britain, if their rivals persisted in dumping their surplus products into the United Kingdom without any regard to the cost of production. Of course, too, the barriers of a high tariff in the protected countries could not be surmounted by the British working under such disadvantageous conditions. Equally futile would prove the at-

tempts to overcome the drawbacks under which the United Kingdom now labors by infusing a different spirit into trades unionism. It is probable that the methods of these organizations handicap trade; but it is difficult to perceive that any concessions they might make to employers would prove of substantial value in a contest which every one clearly recognizes is between the normal and the abnormal. In other words, British labor efficiency, no matter how greatly it might be increased, would not prove an offset to the cuts which the manufacturers of protected countries are ready to make in order to prevent their home markets from becoming unprofitable.

There is only one method by which Great Britain may successfully combat the modern tendency. She must resort to the plans of her rivals. There is no difficulty in the way of her doing so except a purely theoretical one. It is not true, as many Cobdenites assume, that a resort to protection would have the result of crippling British industry. That might prove to be the case if the work of constructing a tariff were bunglingly done; but there is no reason why it should be. The adoption of a protective tariff does not call for an assault on the cheap loaf of the workingman, or an attack on raw materials. The United Kingdom may take a hint from American tariff framers, who have learned the art of constructing schedules which scarcely touch the producing classes. There is a Cobdenistic fallacy that the tariff of the United States is an obstacle to production; but it vanishes into thin air when it is examined. Inquiry discloses that the tariff of the United States contains a large free list, and that special pains are taken so to adjust the duties that the payment of them falls on the class best able to bear the tax.

The framers of a British tariff would have a broad field to work in. Nearly the entire amount of manufactured goods now imported into the United Kingdom represents articles consumed by the non-working classes; and it is inconceivable that an enhancement of their price to the British consumer would increase the cost of production of the staple and other manufactures of the British Isles. If the man or woman who wears French gloves is obliged to pay a shilling a pair more for them, the workers in the textile factories and the rolling mills will not suffer in consequence; nor will the latter experience any inconvenience if the British legislator, in his wisdom, sees fit to impose a duty on *pâté de foie gras* and other luxuries consumed by those who neither toil nor spin. The British, who profess to revere the teachings of Adam Smith, ought to know this. He has told them plainly that "taxes upon luxuries have no tendency to raise the price of any other commodities except that of the

commodities taxed."¹ They might also profit from an equally pregnant observation by the same writer that

"the advanced price of such manufactures as are real necessities of life, and are destined for the consumption of the poor—of coarse woollens, for example—must be compensated to the poor by a farther advancement of their wages."

If the British had the courage to act on the sound doctrine these two quotations inculcate, they would promptly find a way out of what is now regarded by many of their publicists as a commercial impasse. The results would be to relieve the greatly overburdened agricultural industry and permit of its expansion. To emphasize the contention that the policy which was adopted in ignorance of the possibilities of competition might be safely reversed now that the event has contradicted the prophecies of Cobden and his followers, it is not necessary to draw on Kropotkin and other advocates of the idea that the British Isles, by resorting to an intensive system of farming, could easily produce enough to maintain an even greater population than that which now inhabits them. If the free traders will take the trouble to turn to the speeches of Cobden and the writings of John Stuart Mill, J. E. Thorold Rogers, and others, they will see that British agriculture was regarded as safe from foreign assault. It has not proved so. Therefore, it is rational now to adopt means for its defence, especially when it is self-evident that the result would be to relieve the burdens of industry and transfer them where they belong.

Chancellors of the Exchequer have had some very difficult budgets to deal with in the past; but the future will present problems which will prove insoluble by ordinary methods. There will have to be a complete change of the incidence of taxation, and a diminution, rather than an increase, of the load borne by the British taxpayer. In a very short time it will be impossible for the British manufacturing industry to bear the burden imposed upon it by the continued expansion of the military and naval programme. Hitherto that important section of the taxpaying class whose incomes have been derived from the profits of trade have been able to meet the Government's exactions; but the signs of the times indicate the approach of a period of unprofitable business, and consequently of shrinking incomes. Such a result cannot be averted if the statesmen of Great Britain persist in the fallacious policy of permitting the United Kingdom to be made the dumping ground for the surplus products of other nations. The increasing dearness of coal and the growing scarcity of iron ores in themselves constitute a sufficient menace to British trade.

¹ "Wealth of Nations," book v., ch. ii.

To accentuate the evils which they produce by exposing the manufacturers and workingmen of the United Kingdom to the kind of competition to which Lord Rosebery and others have drawn attention would prove suicidal.

If Great Britain had the courage to confess that the economic policy she embarked upon is a failure and to stare the situation squarely in the face, many of the difficulties which now confront the British people would disappear as if by magic. A certain class of consumers might take exception to the consequences of the economic awakening; but the industrial and political fate of the nation is by no means dependent upon their fortune or good will. Those to be considered at this juncture are the producers. If affairs are so managed that they may be permitted to continue their useful work, those who live by trade, and their dependents, cannot fail to prosper. But if Great Britain persists in exposing herself to the assaults of commercial rivalry, she must go under. If she elects to defend herself she will solve a difficult problem with comparative ease. By affording the manufacturing and agricultural interests a reasonable degree of protection she will give them new life. The shifting of the incidence of taxation will have the effect of making the conditions of life more passable in the country, and of drawing from the cities a part of the stagnant population the maintenance of which is a public burden; while the manufacturer will have less trouble in making both ends meet.

But more important than anything else that can be mentioned would be the result of this change of policy on the external relations of Great Britain. The Cobdenites have erroneously assumed that their system made for peace. It has not done so. On the contrary, its logical outcome has been aggressiveness. It has been found necessary to extend the British empire to open up new avenues for external trade. This has necessitated an enormous and costly military and naval establishment. If the policy of looking for markets abroad and neglecting those at home is abandoned by Great Britain, she will at once disarm the hostility of her rivals, and she will be able to reduce her army and navy to reasonable proportions. It is not for the defence of the British Isles that the vast sums now annually appropriated under that head are expended. A navy half the present size would more effectually accomplish that object. Half or more of the British expenditure for military purposes is to increase trade; but the simple process of levying a tariff in a manner calculated to protect British industry from the unfair aggressions of foreigners would give the United Kingdom infinitely more trade than

can be obtained by such methods; for, as has already been shown, there is a possibility of increasing domestic production to the extent of over a billion dollars annually. If this were done, Great Britain would still hold the premier position as an importing nation, with an immensely greater free list than any other nation by exempting raw materials from the payment of duties.

Such a course would allay rather than arouse foreign resentment. The difficulty experienced in entering a market does not create hostility. It is the invasion of the home market by the foreigner with his wares that produces ill feeling; for it is in the nature of things that men seeking an opportunity for employment should resent being deprived of the chance of finding it by foreign products displacing the domestically produced articles.

In conclusion, if any one thinks it strange that an American protectionist should advise Great Britain to pursue a course the adoption of which would make it difficult if not impossible to market much of the surplus of the manufactured products of the United States, let him bear in mind that the members of the economic school to which the writer belongs firmly believe that the best results can be derived only from a system which reduces waste to a minimum. The greatest of all waste, in the opinion of modern protectionists, is that involved in unnecessary external trading; therefore, they view with equanimity every movement which tends to bring worker and consumer closer together. To manufacture in Great Britain the things consumed by the British people will have that result; hence they look with favor on a policy which they are assured would bring it about.

JOHN P. YOUNG.

THE SECRETS OF TAMMANY'S SUCCESS.

CONSIDERING the instances of proved dishonesty on the part of many of the leaders of Tammany from its inception as a political organization to the present, and the odium under which this remarkable body has so often gone down in defeat, its longevity is a matter of general surprise. Moreover, its habit of regaining power after crushing reverses forms to many a riddle apparently without explanation. In many parts of the United States, and in other quarters of the world where little or nothing is known of the conditions in New York city, the name and exploits of Tammany Hall are more or less familiar. In England, particularly, Tammany is at once a study and a wonder to a multitude not deeply versed in any other feature of American life, political or social. Even New Yorkers, living in daily contact with the forces, influences, and environment that make the Tammany organization, find it difficult to account for its enduring robustness, and for its faculty of restoring itself to a control of the city government in the face of a widespread knowledge of what such a restoration inevitably means. One class of the voters may be mercenary and actuated by the lowest and most selfish interests. But it would be an unwarranted assumption to stigmatize as such the entire voting element supporting Tammany. Beneath all that organization's known record of continued corruption and pretence, there must be intrinsically strong qualities and powerful popular currents to have guaranteed it its virile existence. During its career of over a century, amid violent party and factional excitement, it has outlived the most odious of its series of misdeeds, and it has seen great national parties rise, wax strong, and crumble into nothingness. Thus, parties have succeeded parties, and generation has supplanted generation, but Tammany Hall still prevails, apparently more secure in its hold and mightier than ever before.

Patient research, investigation, and observation reveal the secrets of this strength. In order to show, in the first place, the original sources of its power, and the gradual changes which enabled it to forestall extinction and rise dominant, it will be necessary to pass in review some of the more salient points in its history.

When the Tammany Society was founded by William Mooney, on May 12, 1789, it was designed simply as a society whose members were sworn to uphold the Constitution and to preserve the liberties of the country. It was not even a political club. In its membership were men of different political leanings, all united in the general purpose to oppose the introduction of any form of government smacking too much of a monarchy. Its chief functions were to hold "elegant dinners," to provide for imposing parades on the Fourth of July, and to issue patriotic addresses. So determined were Mooney and his associates in their hostility to even the externals of European customs, that, in ridicule of the societies of St. George, St. Andrew, and St. David, they chose the name of Tammany, an Indian chief of some celebrity, as that of their society, and not only adopted Indian titles for the society's officers, but employed the peculiar Indian ceremonials in its rites and parades.

Until about the end of Washington's second administration the Tammany Society was politically an innocuous body. But in the ever-widening controversy between the forces of centralization, represented by Alexander Hamilton, and those standing for decentralization, headed by Thomas Jefferson, the majority of the society's members took sides with Jefferson; the Federalist members either, for the most part, withdrawing or being reduced to an ineffective minority. Had the regulation of the affairs of the society remained solely in the hands of Mooney and his personal associates, it would have been merely a spectacular body, with its singular mimicry of Indian customs, and its issuing of pompous addresses. But a far more ingenious man, one who carefully estimated its latent possibilities and appreciated its capabilities as a power, grasped, though working through others, the real control of the Tammany Society, and saved it from a death from inanition that at one time threatened it. This was Aaron Burr. Under him and his protégés, the society became political, at first seeking to influence voters through social means and pamphlets, and then in 1806-8 instituting a highly effective organization, apparently distinct from the Tammany Society, but in reality a part of it.

The early history alone of Tammany Hall makes a voluminous narrative. A vast amount of space would be required to describe how it succeeded in carrying the city for Jefferson in 1800; how the same city, which always had been distinguished for its Toryism, was brought under its rule; and how, with varying fortunes, it grew so as to become invincible by 1822. I shall merely point out the essential features which

not only contributed to its success then, but which have exercised a deep influence to this very day.

At this distance of time it is very difficult to form a correct understanding of the prejudice, not to say the hatred borne by class toward class in New York city at the close of the eighteenth century. Entrenched within its sphere by all the favoring influences of European and colonial customs and law, there was, on the one side, an aristocratic class that looked with contempt on all beneath it. Not only did it possess its capacious manors, and its special privileges guaranteed by law, but it controlled trade and had a style of dress distinct from that of the common mass of the people. The aristocrat, with his lace ruffles and attractive sky-blue or other colored satin garments, his powdered wig, and his silver-buckled shoes, formed a notable contrast to the meanly-dressed laborer, with his leather breeches. This aristocratic class, described in the Tory journals of the day as "the respectable element," had habitually, with few exceptions, sneered at the Declaration of Independence and the Revolution, made jests of all notions of political equality, and feted the British officers. To this class belonged those "loyalists" who, after the British evacuation, expatriated themselves to Nova Scotia and other parts, rather than live under the new conditions; while those that remained lost no opportunity, as Dr. John W. Francis tells in his "Reminiscences," of referring superciliously, for decades after, to "the rabble," with whom, in abstract theory at least, they were now on nothing more than an equal footing. But this conception was by no means sustained by the facts. In reality there was no such thing as political, much less social, equality. Some of the best and purest men of the Revolution were permeated by the aristocratic dread of general suffrage, besides being devout believers in the doctrine that the interests of the people were best conserved by placing the voting and administrative powers in the hands of the propertied classes. Hence we find the provisions in the State Constitution of 1777, that only the possessors of actual freeholds to the value of £100, free of all debts, should be allowed to vote for governor, lieutenant-governor, and State senators, and that a vote for the less important office of assemblyman should require the possession of a freehold, in the county, valued at £20, or the payment of forty shillings rent yearly. These provisions remained practically in force until 1822, and were repealed only after the severest agitation.

On the other side were the middle and laboring classes, keenly conscious of their subordinate social, political, and industrial station. They believed that the rich families were not only aiming to retain such

privileges as they already enjoyed, but were seeking to aggrandize themselves in every possible way. In his campaign speeches and addresses, Alexander Hamilton took special pains to assure the people at large of the baselessness of this charge. Nevertheless, the bitter class feeling formed a line of division, which time, instead of obliterating, only the more accentuated. To this class struggle Tammany owed its first successes; and this identical factor forms the first of the secrets of its series of triumphs.

The rich needed no special body to safeguard their interests in the early part of the century. Law and force of custom, as I have mentioned, tended to do that. Moreover, every person who expected to profit by their patronage and influence was their devoted advocate. The poor, however, felt the want of a defender who could secure them the political and social reforms they demanded. This they found in the Tammany Society, which was composed mainly of poor men or tradesmen. There were at this time various factions in the Republican party — chiefly the "Clintonites," and the "Martling," or Tammany men, so called from Martling's tavern, where their meetings were held. The "Clintonites" were the followers of De Witt Clinton, who, from 1802 to his death, in 1828, fought Tammany unrelentingly. The decrees of the leaders of the Tammany Society were obeyed for some years with scarcely a murmur by the majority of local Republicans, for the reason that it was held to be the incarnation of opposition to the aristocracy; and when, in 1806-8, the popular voice demanded that a voters' organization should be substituted in place of a few self-constituted leaders, the general, correspondence, finance, and nominating committees were formed, in accordance with the general view, first, that the aristocratic element would be best overthrown by a systematic and continuous organization; and, second, that it would place nominating and other political powers more directly in the hands of the voters.

Instead of diminishing in force, this class animosity grew annually. The aristocracy, for the most part, opposed the War of 1812; and, owing to its powerful help, joined with the unpopularity of the Embargo Act and the official dishonesty of a number of Tammany's leaders, the Federalists were enabled more or less to rule the city from 1809 to the end of that war. To the masses, if we may so term them, the aristocracy not only represented a distinct class, but appeared to be inimical to Republican institutions. Thus, in June, 1814, a gathering of Federalists in Washington Hall spoke sneeringly of democracy, and drank toasts to the success of the allied monarchs of Europe over Napoleon. A crowd,

learning the purport of the business, mobbed the hall, and desisted only after twenty of its leaders had been arrested. Again, in 1819, 1820, and 1821 the aristocracy vehemently opposed the proposition of manhood suffrage. Its orators, representatives, and writers passionately assailed the idea, and predicted the general ruin of the community's best interests, should the constitutional amendment be adopted. Ever since the close of the Revolution the property qualifications for voters had been a sore point with the poor; and the manifest unfairness and injustice of these tests rankled in their heads and hearts. A man who had fought all through the Revolution or the War of 1812 was debarred from voting if unable to meet the necessary requirements; while the rich landholder, who in the days of '76 had abetted the British, or in the War of 1812 had tried to paralyze the Government's efforts, was allowed the fullest electoral power. The insulting references constantly made during that agitation to the intelligence of the disfranchised class are amazing to the modern reader. All possible arguments and all available means were employed to defeat the measure; and only after years of effort were its advocates able to achieve success.

Under the new conditions, beginning in 1823 and 1826, when every citizen had the right to vote, Tammany Hall became more than ever the chosen rallying party of the masses. It was so powerful in the city in those years that frequently the remaining Federalists refused to make nominations. Its organization had never been developed outside the city limits, but within them it was in a perfect state of working order and discipline. The Federalists, as a party, were well-nigh disorganized. The scatterings that remained might have had an abundance of money, influential newspapers, gifted orators, and business and social prestige; but they could not muster anything approaching even an imitation of Tammany's superb organization. Not only was the creation of this latter due, as I have mentioned, to the force of popular feeling against the aristocracy, but the very discipline and "boss" rule of Tammany were likewise its direct results. The different ward meetings passed resolution after resolution, on different occasions, in the twenties, vesting the most autocratic powers in the general committee, and declaring for "regular nominations" only, because of the fear that the aristocratic party sought to destroy the Republican party by inciting a variety of nominations and attempting to weaken the organization. In course of time, these autocratic powers became centred in a clique of leaders, finally culminating, in 1867, as a natural evolution, in the supreme leader or "boss."

By the year 1829 a new form of aristocracy had been developed, denounced, in the language of the time, as the "money aristocracy." This was composed of various banking and commercial interests, which had secured, generally by fraudulent means, enormously valuable special privileges at the expense of the community. The feeling against it was so strong that the powerful Workingman's party arose in 1829, advocating reforms of the most radical character. This movement would have attained a more enduring life, had it not been mainly for the fact that all Republicans, or Democrats, as they were now known, joined in supporting Jackson against the United States Bank. Here, again, class bitterness showed itself to a remarkable degree; though the State banks, for interested purposes, sided with Jackson, and hence deprived the campaign of any aspect of rigid class-lines. In 1834 the formidable Equal Rights party, based upon much the same lines as the Workingmen's party, arose, and warred upon both the Whigs and Tammany Hall; though the greater part of its men were Tammany voters, who had at first tried to effect reform inside the organization. For, however perennial Tammany resolutions might declaim against the money aristocracy, its chiefs were a part of that aristocracy. Nearly every one of the thirty-six members of the general committee was a president or director of some corporation enjoying great legal powers; and nearly every prominent Tammany man had voted or lobbied for measures creating banks or other corporations — measures evoking great popular criticism and discontent. It was not until the Equal Rights party had demonstrated its ability to defeat Tammany in a three-cornered contest, with much agitation and a riot or two, that the masses inside the Tammany organization seized the reins of power from their self-seeking leaders, and adopted a satisfactory plan of reforms. Its advocacy of Van Buren's sub-treasury scheme caused the State-bank owners to withdraw from the Hall in 1837. In 1840 it became known more than ever as distinctively "the champion of the poor," as in that year the very lowest classes obtained supremacy, and the ward heelers began to overrun and rule the organization.

Here, then, is the first of the secrets of Tammany's success: its sympathy and stand for the common people and its working with them. Its resolutions against aristocracy read the same, excepting slight differences in diction, in the year 1898 as they did in the year 1800. Tammany's leaders stole from the city, State, and general government; and they constantly imposed such misgovernment as would have wrecked a dozen times over a city of less fabulous resources. Nevertheless, despite the

duplicity of its leaders, the Hall has ever stood before the poor as their friend. In 1824 the general committee fulminated thus against Clinton :

"He is haughty in his manners and a friend of the aristocracy — cold and distant to all who cannot boast of wealth and family distinctions, and selfish in all the ends he aims at."

In 1868, the general committee, of which Tweed was the head, announced, in advocating the election of John T. Hoffman as Governor:

" . . . He is the friend of the poor, the sympathizer with the naturalized citizen, and the foe to all municipal oppression in the form of all odious and other excessive requisitional laws. . . . Is not the pending contest preëminently one of capital against labor, of money against popular rights, and of political power against the struggling interests of the masses ? "

In 1898, Senator Grady harangued violently in Tammany Hall against the aristocracy, and resolutions passed by the organization that year had a similar substance.

I have chosen here instances, at widely separated intervals, showing the intensity of class feeling and prejudice from before the formation of the Government itself to the present day, and the tactical advantage that Tammany has enjoyed in posing before the multitude as its defender. If this feeling was conspicuous before 1840, it has become more so since, with the tremendous influx of poverty-stricken immigrants, which, beginning about the year 1846, has continued in fluctuating force. The struggle for a livelihood has increased in intensity, and nowhere in America is there another city of such sharp economic contrasts as New York. It cannot be denied that great numbers of the voters, while knowing the methods of Tammany, are, nevertheless, firm in their belief that the elements opposed to Tammany Hall are, for the most part, far more sinister in their refinement of corruption and pretensions of superiority. They admit Tammany's unenviable record; yet they insist that many of the "reformers," whose paramount conception of reform is to war on the petty evidences of corruption, are men who, themselves or through agents, have been the instigators of those more dangerous modes of corruption which have debauched legislative and aldermanic bodies into conferring on them special privileges of such magnitude that their value, expressed in adequate money terms, would seem stupendous. Thousands upon thousands of voters would prefer to support a real reform movement, seeking to remedy, however gradually, the actual civic and industrial conditions. When such an alternative is not presented, they choose to cast their ballots for Tammany; believing that, whatever its corrup-

tion, it does not represent such an ultimate power for evil as many of its opponents do.

While this class feeling has contributed to Tammany's permanency and its recurrent restoration to power, it has not been the sole factor by any means. It always gave Tammany a certain popular support apart from the enrolled members of the organization committees. Very often this support has meant victory; but there have been times when Tammany's extremely unpalatable administration alienated a potent part of its supporters and brought its dismissal from power. But such defections were those of that independent fringe of voters who generally side with Tammany, and not those of the tens of thousands who vote for the "regular" Tammany ticket, year in, year out. This independent vote is a well-known factor in local politics; and it is periodically swollen by disgruntled Tammany men who have failed in some ulterior object. The independents have so often proved their ability to hold the balance of power that Tammany Hall makes the greatest effort to retain their goodwill; knowing that it can depend upon a large following otherwise from class feeling and the necessities of its army of office-holders or seekers. The blunders of the "reformers" have invariably estranged these independents after a short time; the consequence being that, joined with the vote of its class followers and organization men, Tammany has been able, after a brief exile from office, to return triumphantly to the spoils.

Upon class feeling, therefore, all the various activities of Tammany Hall have been, and are, built. The other secrets of its success are methods and plans of action. Underlying these is that sagacity of its leaders which, at critical moments, has not only averted defeat, but distinctively strengthened Tammany Hall.

In the early part of the nineteenth century Tammany was a non-Catholic, non-foreign body. Not only did the extreme prejudice against the holding of office by Catholics and foreigners cause it to nominate exclusively Protestants and natives, but a foreigner was not even allowed to hold an important post in the Tammany Society. But Tammany was remarkably adaptive, generally responding to every public influence that would yield it success. As immigration increased year by year, and foreigners and Catholics became a more telling power politically and socially, Tammany, with much adroitness, made timely concessions by nominating them for minor offices. And when, by the introduction of manhood suffrage, the electorate was greatly increased, Tammany became professedly the friend of the immigrant. While the Federalists and Whigs abused him and did their best to minimize his efforts in politics,

Tammany, through its organization committees, took him in charge, made his path to naturalization as facile a process as possible, gave him a small or important "job," according to the nature of his influence over his fellows, and altogether impressed him with the idea that, by being a Tammany man, he stood an excellent chance in life. This attachment was riveted by the course of the violently anti-Catholic, anti-foreign, Native American party of 1844-45 and 1854. Thus Tammany secured the lasting fidelity of a large and steadily growing class, which, unacquainted with the problems confronting the native voters, understood only that Tammany Hall did not antagonize it, and that Tammany, whatever its faults, represented, and was good to, the poor. How powerful this class became may be judged from the following figures: In 1855, the native voters in the city numbered 46,173 and the aliens 42,704; ten years later, the State census gave the city 51,500 native and 77,475 naturalized voters. Though there was some doubt as to the correctness of the latter census, the returns of naturalized citizens, swollen as they were to permit fraudulent registration, were significant of the great strength of the alien vote. It stood quite solidly by Tammany in the days of the most flagrant corruption, and formed a phalanx which could always be relied upon.

As Tammany dealt with this particular movement, so did it deal with other movements. Nothing could exceed its *finesse*, after the War of 1812, in breaking up the rapidly disintegrating Federalist party by giving the most important offices at its disposal to able Federalists disgusted with the anti-war policy of their party. Nearly every opposing party or faction down to the present day has been dealt with on the same line or similar lines whenever possible. More modern instances can be mentioned in the County Democracy of 1880-1887, the labor movement of 1887, and the factional parties combating it between 1894 and 1897. Many of the leaders of these were gradually won over with gifts of nominations for, or appointments to, high offices. In fact, so consistently has Tammany Hall pursued this systematic policy of dissolving rival organizations, that it has been a time-honored axiom in local politics that the surest way to obtain a most respectful recognition by Tammany is to start a counter Democratic organization. The more formidable it appears the higher will be the reward.

It is needless to say, however, that all the various parties opposed to Tammany, from the year 1800, have not been broken by such means. The exigencies of National politics alone, not to speak of the principles involved, have always played a very considerable part in local politics,

and have kept alive a party struggle based upon more than the spoils. State issues, also, have affected the political cast of the city. Such being the case, Tammany's resources have been various and most cleverly applied. Its chiefs refrained from actively supporting the manhood suffrage agitation until the public voice in the entire State for the change grew unmistakably strong; and then, with great enthusiasm, they thrust themselves forward as its leaders. They resisted De Witt Clinton's policy of internal improvements until they realized its overshadowing popularity, when they suddenly favored giving for that object so large an appropriation as to make Tammany Hall appear a better friend of State canals than Clinton himself. Tammany could not buy off the sincere leaders of the Workingmen's party in 1829, but it drew off that party's support by championing some of the measures loudly demanded, and thus on through many instances. In other crises, when the opposition proved unusually strong, Tammany's leaders played the game so well that the opposition, instead of combining against the Wigwam, were split into separate, independent parties at war over some National question of principle, or some local question of expediency; the inevitable result being that Tammany, with its compact organization, won again and again. Without recalling occasions in the remote past the local campaign of 1897 may be noticed. Had the Citizens' Union and the Republican party combined on candidates, they would have had a clear majority of all the votes. The reasons for their not forming this combination will not be set forth here; but some of the facts, as privately told, form an interesting chapter in the story of the superior crafty handiwork of Tammany's chiefs.

A more momentous question with which Tammany has now and then had to grapple has been the almost equal division of the city's Democratic voters in contending organizations; for one of the main pillars of the Wigwam's strength lies in its pretensions to represent the National Democratic party locally. This phase operates to bring to its support a body of voters not connected with its organization, but voting, solely out of party considerations, the "regular Democratic ticket" it presents. When a great rival Democratic organization — not a mere personal faction — arises, then the problem assumes a most serious phase. This was especially so from 1880 to 1886, when the County Democracy gathered to itself about one-half the local Democratic voters. In the campaign of 1886, Tammany's "boss," Mr. Croker, made a brilliant flank move by choosing, as Tammany's selection for mayor, Mr. Abram S. Hewitt, the County Democracy's candidate; thus allying the two organizations for the time, and preventing by this and other means the election of Henry

George. Later, the County Democracy was completely wiped out by some of the means heretofore indicated.

This constant display of sagacity has been reinforced by other energies. When necessary and possible, Tammany has not failed to resort to ballot-box stuffing, the bribing of voters, and fraudulent naturalizations and canvassing. The specific instances of these are so numerous and so thoroughly matters of record that an enumeration would be superfluous. The other parties have not been above these practices, by any means; the difference having been simply one of degree and opportunity.

Lastly, and in order of importance, comes the matter of organization. Tammany was the first of all political voting bodies to learn that organization means unity and system; carrying with it the strongest possibilities of contributing to consecutive successes. That lesson has been widely diffused; but nowhere else in the world is there such a perfect piece of political mechanism as Tammany Hall. The reason is twofold.

First, there is the Tammany Society, which antedates the organization, and from the year 1811 has owned its own building. The question of quarters, therefore, has never been a disturbing problem. Other parties and factions, born in the enthusiasm of the moment or times, have found the matter of a central headquarters a serious proposition. A few individual leaders have grown tired of supplying funds and of meeting other contingent expenses. The Republican party, it is true, has its local, central meeting-place; but this cannot be compared to the Tammany Hall building, with its many facilities for political action. Moreover, Tammany Hall has its traditions of Democracy; and the poorest voter knows that it has been the rallying centre of the masses from time out of mind. The possession of its building has been of tremendous advantage in elaborating the organization. Not only has convention after convention been held there, but political committees or bodies could meet there every night in the year, if necessary. The value of this desideratum alone will be apparent when it is recalled that Tammany has passed through some very adverse times, with either a low exchequer or an empty one.

The other reason is the character of the organization itself. From the time of its inception, in 1806-8, it has been self-perpetuating. Originally, the voters in each ward chose a ward committee of three, the ward committee constituting a general committee, which had the power of convening all public meetings of the party and of making preparatory arrangements for the approaching elections. The size of the general committee increased with the number of wards, and in 1843

was further enlarged by being based on the election precinct instead of the ward. Still further increases were made during and since 1873. This Tammany Hall general committee now includes over 5,000 members. The action of the general committee was backed by the correspondence, finance, and nominating committees. The latter was composed of seven delegates from each ward, and was the predecessor of the modern nominating convention. These committees were elected for one year; and no sooner did they step out than their successors took their places.

Here was a superb organization, moving, year after year and day after day, with a unity, consistency, and effective system unknown before in politics. Through this machinery every party voter was reached. The general committee knew to a nicety how many votes could be depended upon, how many were doubtful, and how many hostile; and it could take measures accordingly. At first the solidarity of the organization was insured by the popular feeling, already described, that it was necessary to combine against the designs of the aristocratic party by self-interest in the form of the expectation or retention of the spoils. Subsequently — since about 1840 — the latter consideration became the all-dominant one. In contrast to this cohesive organization, the Federalists met only sporadically at banquets, and relied upon the power of their money and superior position in society; though the Whigs did adopt a weak imitation of Tammany's organization in the thirties and forties. But at no time has there been anything approaching a permanent duplication of the Wigwam's "machine."

Where, before Tweed's time, Tammany's affairs had been administered by a clique of leaders, Tweed managed to concentrate almost absolute power in himself, by controlling the general and the other committees and the Tammany Society. As Grand Sachem of the latter, he could turn out of the Tammany Hall building any faction disputing his sway; and, though that faction might later make nominations, it would lack the prestige of "regularity." With Tweed, then, began the absolute "boss" dynasty; the present representative being, it need hardly be said, Richard Croker.

The Tammany organization of to-day is developed to a high pitch of political perfection. Every one of the thirty-six assembly districts in the Boroughs of the Manhattan and the Bronx has its leader, and each of the 892 election districts its captain. All the voters can be reached in a house-to-house canvass within twenty-four hours, if necessary. There are standing committees on finance, printing, correspondence, nat-

uralization, and organization, each of which thoroughly does the duty assigned to it. The general committee meets monthly, and once a year goes through the form of holding a county convention. It is through the executive committee, however, composed generally of the district leaders, that the "Boss" issues his decrees. Above all, Tammany is never at a loss for funds. All Tammany office-holders and many other city employés are expected to contribute. The annual fund from this source alone may be conjectured when it is stated that the city now has about 60,000 employés. All candidates for office are assessed heavily. Gambling-houses, pool-rooms, saloons, and other places also contribute lavishly, as well as corporations of all kinds, and individuals who find it convenient not to incur the hostility of the ruling powers.

In addition, the Tammany Hall organization is made more effective by its social activity. It admirably adapts itself to the environment of each neighborhood, and comes into direct touch with the people. Its leaders give annual dinners to the poor of their districts; they get this or that man out of trouble; if a poor widow is in danger of being dispossessed her case is seen to; "jobs" are distributed; entertainments are held for the benefit of struggling churches; and a thousand and one other varieties of assistance are rendered to the needy. All this, of course, is done selfishly, with a view to strengthening the leader and the organization in the districts, and much of the money used comes from sources that would not bear investigation; but the simple fact of its being done affects powerfully certain classes of voters. This element of human sympathy has more effect with them than all the lofty manifestoes issued by committees or bodies with whom they never come in such personal contact.

GUSTAVUS MYERS.

POE FIFTY YEARS AFTER.

In the history of American authors there has probably not been a life of more pathetic interest than that of Edgar Allan Poe. Indeed, misfortune seems to have pursued him to his grave; and even after his death his memory was unmercifully traduced. Griswold's spiteful and vicious attack in the memoir prefixed to his edition of Poe's works set the fashion, which, except in rare instances, has been followed somewhat blindly. But here and there a few brave writers have dared to offer a word in defence, and to state the facts, even at the risk of being voted biassed and narrow of view. Some essayists, however, emboldened by these sporadic efforts, have recoiled to the other extreme, and by their unbounded admiration of everything that came from Poe's pen have done his cause quite as much harm as those who shamefully defame him. Needless to say, somewhere between these two extremes lies the region of truth. Wholesome advice is contained in the maxim *Ne quid nimis*; and this motto will furnish us a safe guide in literary as well as in political controversies.

It is wellnigh impossible to give a just and correct estimate of an author either during his life or immediately after his death. Proximity to a beautiful landscape distorts our view, and prevents our receiving a correct and adequate impression of its beauty. We must get the proper perspective and view the landscape from a point not too near, on the one hand, or too remote, on the other. Surely, then, after the lapse of half a century we may turn our glass upon Poe, in the hope of obtaining a fairer and more adequate view of the author's genius than was possible on the part of his contemporaries.

Poe's detractors have indicted him on the charge of gross immorality. To be more specific, they have said that he was an habitual drunkard, an ingrate, a scoffer, and a libertine. Now, it is not the purpose of this paper to defend Poe against the charge of occasional drunkenness. Not even his most ardent admirers, unless so utterly biassed as to be incapable of appreciating an established fact, would, I fancy, attempt to exonerate him from this accusation. But, while it is true that Poe indulged

all too freely his convivial passion, it is equally true that he endeavored to abstain, and that he actually did abstain, from such indulgence sometimes for several months in succession. Like many others, however, he had been reared in a household where liberal potations seem to have been encouraged, or, at all events, not forbidden. Poe, unfortunately, inherited from his parents, who were stage people, a lack of self-control; and it was against this inherited weakness and deficiency in will-power that he fought with varying success and failure all his mature years, until at last he yielded and sank down in utter despair.

Little need be said in reply to the other specific charges. The conviction has grown upon me, after a careful study of his life and works, that, although at times he seemed to show but scant appreciation of the kindnesses bestowed upon him by some of his friends, Poe nevertheless was not an ingrate. He had many friends, who, when after his death an attempt was made by his enemies to plant thorns upon his grave, interposed and themselves planted roses there. I do not believe Poe was a scoffer. Nor, on the other hand, do I think that he had any deep and abiding religious convictions, or that he ever drew much comfort from his religion. In reference to the last count in the indictment, I feel, after reading Professor Woodberry's biography, that few men have ever proved more devoted and faithful husbands than did Poe to his beautiful but frail Virginia. Upon the evidence of Mrs. Clemm, Poe's mother-in-law, his conjugal relations were entirely free from every discordant element; and his untiring devotion to his wife in her last lingering illness was as beautiful as it was pathetic. Moreover, there is not the slightest suggestion of immorality in any poem or story which Poe wrote. His works are as chaste as an icicle. This is far more than can be said of much of our present-day fiction.

Poe's genius may be considered in a threefold aspect. He may be regarded as a critic, as a poet, and as a romancer. In each of these realms Poe attained to eminence; but it is only in the last two aspects that I wish especially to consider him now. I need hardly say that I do not intend by this to imply any disparagement of his critical genius. On the contrary, Poe, in my judgment, is rightly entitled to the distinction of being the first American man of letters to write criticism deserving the name. Before his advent into journalism criticism had been but little better than fulsome flattery. After his appearance journalistic criticism entered upon a new era. His reviews, though frequently drastic, and sometimes, it must be admitted, inspired by personal prejudice, had, nevertheless, a wholesome and stimulating effect upon American author-

ship. His "Marginalia" awakened a sense of injustice and resentment in the breasts of the more virile, and struck sheer terror to the hearts of the weaklings. Mr. Stedman justly calls his sketches "a prose Dunciad, waspish and unfair, yet not without touches of magnanimity." It has been truly observed that whenever Poe, unbiassed by personal motives, pronounced favorably upon the talents of an author, such as Bayard Taylor, Mrs. Browning, or Tennyson, his judgments have been sustained by the verdict of the present generation. But his prejudice made him merciless and unrelenting to the New England poets, as a class. According to his view nothing good or beautiful could come out of the Nazareth of Boston. It need hardly be remarked that the present generation has, in many instances, reversed Poe's critical dicta.

But enough of Poe as a critic. Let us now take up his poetry. In his masterly essay on Thomas Gray, Matthew Arnold says of that writer that his whole history as a poet is contained in a remark, made by an appreciative friend, to the effect that "he never spoke out in poetry." The same remark is equally applicable to Poe; for it is a common feeling, shared alike by the present generation and by his contemporaries, that he never really gave complete utterance to the poetry which kindled his imagination and stirred his soul.

Poe was not a prolific writer. All the poetry that he ever published could be pressed between the covers of a very slender book. But volume is not the only, or even the main, criterion in determining the standing of a poet. Indeed, it is rather an insignificant factor. In the determination of a poet's standing, spontaneity and passion, not volume, are the criteria. "Poetry," says Poe, in the preface to his juvenile productions, "has been with me a passion, not a purpose." Still, we heartily wish that he had written more of purpose, though no less of passion.

It must be conceded that Poe's range of subject — his register, to borrow a musical term — was quite narrow. In his youth, as a critic has observed, he struck the key-notes of a few themes; and the output of his mature years was but a variation on these. The death, in his youth, of a lady to whom he was devoted made a profound impression upon his susceptible heart, and filled his soul with a poignant feeling of sadness and of longing for one far removed from human companionship and beyond recall. This henceforth was to be the inspiration of his genius and the burden of his song. Says Mr. Edmund Gosse, the eminent English critic, himself no mean poet: "If Poe had not harped so persistently on his one theme of remorseful passion for the irrevocable dead, if he had employed his extraordinary, his unparalleled gifts of

melodious invention, with equal skill, in illustrating a variety of themes, he must have been with the greatest poets."

Poe's best-known poems, those upon which his fame as a poet rests, are "The Raven," first of all, "The Bells," "For Annie," "Ulalume," "The City in the Sea," "The Haunted Palace," and "The Conqueror Worm." Of these "The Raven," written in 1845, is by far the most widely known, and deservedly the most popular. With its publication Poe, like Byron with the publication of "Childe Harold," leaped immediately into fame. His manuscript articles which, up to this time, editors had kept in dark pigeon-holes were now brought to the light of day, and were greatly in request; and enterprising magazines were eager to announce, as a special attraction, a new poem by the author of "The Raven." The instant success of this production provoked a new edition of Poe's writings, which appeared toward the end of the year 1845, under the title, "The Raven and Other Poems." This volume contained wellnigh all the verse Poe had ever written. The early poems had undergone alterations more or less slight, in accordance with the author's fashion of recasting and republishing his early work as if it were appearing for the first time.

In view of the popularity of "The Raven" and of its importance as being Poe's greatest poem, it will not be out of place to linger over it for a while and notice it somewhat in detail. In his "Philosophy of Composition," Poe gives a detailed account of his method of composing "The Raven" and of its *motif*; and the story has such a *vraisemblance* and such a positiveness about it as almost to compel belief. Moreover, the author's peculiar views, which he set forth elsewhere, in respect of the poetic principle are involved in the account; and he uses "The Raven" to illustrate his theory as to the aim and scope of poetry.

Poe believed, with Coleridge, that the pleasure arising from the contemplation of beauty is keener, more chaste, and more elevating to the soul than that which springs from the contemplation of truth by the mere intellect, or even than that which springs from any passion of the heart. He maintained, further, that it is through this sentiment of beauty that man acquires his clearest conceptions of eternal nature, and is consequently brought into closest touch with the divine. This subtle power exists in the beauty of nature, which inspires man with a belief in something beyond nature, fairer and more beautiful still, to be discerned only by the imagination. It is the province of art to fashion this ideal beauty for the gratification of man's spiritual emotion. This is the end and aim of all the fine arts, but more especially of the crown-

ing arts of music and poetry. The incitements of passion, the precepts of duty, and even the lessons of truth are included; but they must be subordinated to the main point of the contemplation of beauty. It follows, therefore, that beauty is the sole legitimate theme of poetry; and so Poe defined poetry as "the rhythmical creation of beauty."

However, Poe in his definition did not take the term beauty in its widest and broadest sense, which would include all truth, emotion, and ethics. On the contrary, he restricted the term to what he was pleased to call supernal beauty, that is, the domain of sadness and regret. He regarded a beautiful woman as the very quintessence of beauty, and the death of such a woman as the most poetical theme in the world. This is the *motif* and inspiration of "The Raven." On the general principle that vice can never be beautiful, of course nothing base or degrading could legitimately fall within the province of poetry.

As a minor consideration Poe insisted that, from the very nature of our mental constitution, it is necessary that a poem be brief and aim at a single artistic effect, since the undivided attention cannot be held for several consecutive hours by one subject. This canon, however, was inspired by Schlegel's dictum of the unity or totality of interest. Such a long poem as the "Iliad," the "Odyssey," or "Paradise Lost," according to Poe's theory, depends for its interest and effect upon the various briefer incidents or poems which go to make it up. When we read a poem of great length the attention naturally relaxes at intervals; and, since the interest is not sustained throughout, the poem fails to produce a single artistic effect. Furthermore, Poe maintained that, in order for a poem to produce a characteristic effect, it should possess a distinct rhythm or metre, together with a certain grotesqueness of conception and quaintness of language. Now, all these conditions, Poe claimed, were met in "The Raven" in particular, and in his other poems in general. For in the former we find as the *motif* of the poem the death of a beautiful woman, Lenore; the unique refrain "Nevermore;" a certain grotesqueness of conception in the setting; and an air of quaintness about the language.

Like Lanier, another Southern singer whose career offers almost as many pathetic incidents, Poe was endowed by nature with a keen appreciation of rhythm and music. He was preëminently a melodist; and, what is more, the melody of his verse has not been equalled in the history of American literature, and is not surpassed by any British poet. But, as has been already stated, his register was not wide. Within a limited range he could and did achieve remarkable results, as in the re-

frain of "The Bells" or "The Raven." The musical effect of the ballad of either of these poems was, up to the time of their publication, unequalled, and it has not been surpassed since. Poe, with a few choice words, like Paganini with his simple violin, produced a spell which was truly marvellous. It is said of the great musician that such was his control of his instrument, and such his perfection of technique, that in every part of musical Europe even with his very first notes he held vast audiences spell-bound. It may be said of Poe that such was his intuitive sense of beauty, and such the melody of his verse, that he arrested the reluctant attention of the reading public of the two English-speaking nations, and by his haunting music cast a glamour over their poets which none of them, after repeated efforts, has ever since succeeded in reproducing. Mr. Gosse tells us that Poe has proved himself to be the Piper of Hamelin to all later English poets, of whom there is hardly one whose verse music does not show traces of his influence. Surely, it is no small distinction thus to have stamped the impress of one's own genius for melodious verse upon the succeeding generation of English poets, and that, too, of the Victorian era.

Poe is sometimes called a poet of one poem; and the criticism is not altogether unjust. For to the world at large he is generally known as the author of "The Raven." I think Mr. Stedman comes nearer the truth, however, when in an epigrammatic sentence he says: "Poe was not a single-poem poet, but a poet of a single mood." The theme is the same in almost all his poems, namely, ruin. This is the burden of his song; this is the one poetic subject that always kindled his imagination. To be sure, the treatment varies, as might be expected; but the inspiration of his poetry is almost invariably drawn from this one source. "*Israfel*" furnishes an exception, but it is an exception which proves the rule.

This is Poe's greatest limitation; and a serious limitation it certainly is. It undermines the foundation of his claim to being regarded a great poet, in the sense that English poets like Milton, Dryden, Byron, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and many others that might be named are entitled to rank as great poets. Poe, in my judgment, is an artist in verse; a great artist, indeed, but hardly a great poet. It is true that he possesses "originality in the treatment of themes, perennial charm, exquisite finish in execution, and distinction of individual manner"—elements of poetical greatness as set forth by an eminent English essayist and critic—but he lacks, it seems to me, one of the qualifications needed to entitle him to rank with the great poets. His fatal defect is

his narrowness of range. "The Raven" may wing its ceaseless flight through anthologies, and be admired by generations yet unborn; but this alone does not make its author a great poet any more than the "Elegy Written in a Country Churchyard" entitles Gray to rank with the world's great poets. However, although this Southern poet may fail of the distinction of being entitled to rest in the Valhalla of the world's great poets, yet, in my opinion, he justly deserves to rank with the greatest American poets, if, indeed, he is not the very greatest among them.

But it is time for us to consider our author in the aspect of romance. Dearly as he loved it, poetry was never a serious purpose with Poe, as he himself informed the reading public in his youthful preface. It was upon his prose romance and his critical work that he relied to establish his fame. Upon these he was willing to stake his claim to immortality. It ought to be remarked here, however, that it was more especially in the province of romance that he exhibited, in the highest degree, his intellectual force — his vigorous imagination and his acute analytical powers. He has handed down his name to the present generation as the founder of the school of writers, now so popular, who practise the short story. He also deserves the distinction of being the founder of the modern detective story and the modern sea story. Dr. A. Conan Doyle, whether he acknowledges it or not, must be classed as a disciple of Poe; for his "Adventures of Sherlock Holmes" is but the method of Poe carried to its logical conclusion.

Poe's power developed early. Indeed, his genius may be called precocious. Some of his early stories were among his best, and were hardly surpassed in his mature years. His earliest effort, "A MS. Found in a Bottle," exhibits practically the same distinctive qualities as appear in the flower of his work. The difference is one of degree, not of kind. That was a suggestive comment made by Kennedy, to whom young Poe submitted his maiden manuscript: "The young fellow is highly imaginative, and a little given to the terrific." And the criticism is just; for there is no story written by Poe which is not more or less grotesque, and which does not give unmistakable evidence of the author's rare gift of imagination.

His stories naturally divide themselves into two classes: first, the analytical tales, dealing with the grotesque and the terrible; and, secondly, the speculative tales, dealing with the weird and the supernatural. Examples of the former class are "The Black Cat," "The Gold-Bug," "The Tell-tale Heart," and "The Murders in the Rue Morgue;" examples of

the latter are "The Fall of the House of Usher," "Ligeia," "A Tale of the Ragged Mountains," and "William Wilson." The latter class constitutes the author's earlier work in fiction. In the tales of this class Poe gradually worked up to a *dénouement* through a complicated series of facts and incidents. In the tales of the former group, starting with the *dénouement*, he gradually unravelled the plot by his ratiocinative method until he worked his way, incident by incident, back to the very beginning. The end aimed at is different, as well as the starting-point. In the imaginative group it is the emotional element which is emphasized; whereas in the ratiocinative group the solution of the mystery is all important, and the attention is accordingly focussed upon the incidents leading up to this mystery. In both classes of tales Poe showed his inventive genius, his rare imagination, and his subtle artistic power in the selection and in the grouping of the facts — this last especially in the ratiocinative tales.

The following paragraph is interesting as setting forth in the author's own words the aim which he sought and the method which he followed in the construction of his tales:

"A skilful literary artist has constructed a tale. If wise, he has not fashioned his thoughts to accommodate his incidents; but having conceived, with deliberate care, a certain unique or single *effect* to be wrought out, he then invents such incidents — he then combines such events as may best aid him in establishing this pre-conceived effect. If his very initial sentence tend not to the out-bringing of this effect, then he has failed in his first step. In the whole composition there should be no word written, of which the tendency, direct or indirect, is not to the one pre-established design. And by such means, with such care and skill, a picture is at length painted which leaves in the mind of him who contemplates it, with a kindred art, a sense of the fullest satisfaction. The idea of the tale has been presented unblemished, because undisturbed; and this is an end unattainable by the novel."

In all Poe's stories, subtly conceived and cleverly and exquisitely executed as some of them incontestably are, there is no one character that has taken hold of the affections or that really lives. Poe never painted a single live character. Though a consummate artist, he yet lacked that subtle power of characterization which Thackeray exhibited, in so eminent a degree, in the creation of his immortal Becky Sharp, and Dickens in the creation of his equally famous Sam Weller. These characters are as well known as if they had been real flesh and blood, and will doubtless continue to live in the affections of the people as long as English literature lives. But we search in vain in Poe's fiction for any counterpart to the tactful, impudent Becky Sharp or the resourceful Sam Weller. We find nothing in Poe that even remotely approaches either

of these famous characters. His men and women are as cold as marble, and about as destitute of feeling. They do not appeal to the sympathies; they do not touch the heart. They are clever sketches, faultlessly drawn; but they are, after all, simply "ingenious studies in black and white." Pygmalion so loved Galatea, the beautiful creation of his chisel, that the gods inspired the cold marble with life, to satisfy the prayerful yearning of the artist's heart. But Poe never had any deep reverence or tender feeling for any of the cold, soulless creations of his genius. It is said that some novelists have wept when they have killed the heroes of their own invention. Poe was not of these. He did not hesitate to alter and make over again any of his uninspired, lifeless characters, or even to reduce Deity itself — as in "*Eureka*" — to a mere mathematical formula. Poe's men and women were conceived in the head, not in the heart, and born of the intellect; consequently they had no warmth of feeling, no soul. This fatal defect in characterization is due, in large measure, to Poe's woe-ful lack of human sympathy and his utter lack of humor. In no other part of his writings did he make such a signal, glaring failure as in his humorous tales.

Moreover, Poe did not know how to combine people and situations in ordinary life. He could paint one character only at a time. He never learned the art of painting from life, and never succeeded in portraying characters in their interplay upon one another. Indeed, when he painted he took his models not from real life, but from his own imagination. He was the victim of his own over-developed fancy. Here is the weak spot in Poe's artistic equipment. His imagination was abnormally developed, and he lacked the will-power to control and direct it. It was this abnormal imagination that gave color and direction to all he ever achieved, not only in fiction, but also in actual life. It was the promptings of his imagination that he followed when, in his effort to throw men and women upon the canvas, he projected morbid persons like himself, not robust, healthy characters. He could, it is true, invent single situations that resembled those of actual life; but he could not follow these up in a natural sequence. In short, he was a romancer, not a novelist. I believe, with Mr. Stedman, that Poe could never have written a novel.

Yet, despite the limitations of his tales Poe was an entertaining, a charming romancer withal. Of his sixty tales or prose narratives it will be found, when they are sifted, that only about a third deserve to live. But these will live; and they have already won for their author, abroad as well as at home, a fame which, perhaps, no other American

has excelled. By his intellectual characteristics he seems to have appealed to the French reading public with special force. Indeed, the French were the first foreigners to discover his star, which they hailed with characteristic delight — a star whose light, after more than half a century, shows no sign of waning brilliance. It appears from the biography appended to the definitive edition of Poe by Messrs. Stedman and Woodberry that between 1890 and 1895 there were made at least ten translations of his works into various foreign languages. What can have brought about such a remarkable result? In a word, it must be Poe's unique genius — his intense originality, which has hardly been paralleled in literary history, and his indefinable, inimitable charm of manner, which appeals not simply to men of one particular clime or country, but to all men everywhere.

EDWIN W. BOWEN.

WRITERS IN THE JUNE FORUM.

MR. KARL BLIND, born at Mannheim, Germany, Sept. 4, 1826, was educated at Heidelberg and Bonn universities. Active for German union and freedom, was imprisoned in Bavaria and Baden before the Revolution of 1848, in which he took a leading part, at Karlsruhe. After participating in the Republican rising led by Hecker, was arrested at Strasburg on a false charge of being implicated in the Paris insurrection in June, and was transported to Switzerland. Was leader of the second Republican rising in the Black Forest, and fought at Staufen. A prisoner of war, and court-martialled, his life was saved by the secret sympathy of two members of the Court. After eight months' captivity was sentenced to eight years' imprisonment, but was liberated by the people and the army who overthrew the Grand-ducal government in 1849. Was member of the Embassy at Paris of the Democratic Governments of Baden and Rhenish Palatinate. Was arrested, under Louis Napoleon, in violation of the law of nations, after the overthrow of Ledru-Rollin's rising for the protection of the Roman Republic, and proscribed from France. Carried on a Democratic and National propaganda from England. Co-operated with Garibaldi, Mazzini, and other European leaders. Has published numerous essays on politics, archaeology, history, mythology, philosophy, and ancient German and Norse literature.

PROF. EDWIN W. BOWEN was born in southern Maryland in 1866. In 1889 was graduated with the degree of A. M. from Randolph-Macon College, Virginia. Immediately entered the Johns Hopkins University to take advanced courses in English, Latin, and German, and from this institution received his Ph. D. degree in 1892. Upon his graduation was elected Assistant-Professor of English in the University of Missouri, which position he resigned after a tenure of one year in order to prosecute further his studies in Europe. Spent the following year at the University of Leipzig, pursuing advanced courses in Teutonic philology and literature. In 1894 was elected to the chair of Latin in Randolph-Macon College, his present position. Has published several monographs on English philology, both in European and American journals, and from time to time has contributed essays of a literary character to the magazines.

MR. ABRAHAM CAHAN was born in 1860 near Wilna, Russia. Graduated from the Teachers' Institute of Wilna and taught in a public school. Became implicated in the Nihilist propaganda, and fled for his liberty to Austria; subsequently came to America. In 1896 attracted attention by his "Yekl, a Tale of the New York Ghetto," which work was followed by "The Imported Bridegroom and other stories of the Ghetto." Has contributed stories and sketches to leading American magazines, and is at present connected with the New York "Commercial Advertiser."

MR. HAROLD MARTIN was born in New York in 1870. At the outbreak of the Spanish-American war entered the service of the Associated Press, which he represented in Porto Rico and Cuba. Was also correspondent for "Harper's Weekly" and "Collier's Weekly." Represented the Associated Press in the Philippines from July, 1899, to December, 1900.

MR. GUSTAVUS MYERS was born in 1874 at Trenton, N. J. Was educated in the public schools of Philadelphia. Later served as reporter and editor on various newspapers in Philadelphia and New York. Is author of "The History of Public Franchises in New York City," published in May, 1900, and "The History of Tammany Hall," issued in January, 1901.

PROF. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, born in Boston, 1847, graduated from Harvard in 1869 and from Harvard Divinity School in 1872. Is D.D. of Yale. Held the pastorate of the First Parish Church, Cambridge, from 1874 to 1880, when he was appointed Parkman Professor of Theology in Harvard Divinity School. Since 1886 has been Plummer Professor of Christian Morals. Is author of "Mornings in the College Chapel," "Short Addresses to Young Men on Personal Religion," and other works.

THE REV. ALDEN WALKER QUIMBY was born near Womelsdorf, Pennsylvania, in 1864, and received his early education in the schools of his mother, father, and maternal grandfather, Walker Stephen, a nonagenarian who taught for half a century. In 1878 the Methodist Episcopal Church called him into its ministry. Holds a pastorate at Berwyn, Pa. Has lectured extensively, and contributed to various magazines.

PROF. PAUL S. REINSCH was born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, in 1869. Was educated at the University of Wisconsin, and studied contemporary politics in England, Germany, France, and Italy. Is Professor of Political Science in the University of Wisconsin. Has published monographs on the common law in the American colonies and on "French Experience with Representative Government in the West Indies," and a book on "World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century."

MR. ALBERT GARDNER ROBINSON was born in Winchester, Mass., in 1855. On leaving school, entered commercial life. In this he remained for some twenty-five years, until the beginning of the Spanish-American war, in the spring of 1898, when he accepted a position as correspondent for the New York "Evening Post." In that capacity has served in Porto Rico, going out with the earliest detachment of troops, and remaining until after the taking of formal possession, at San Juan; in Cuba, where he watched the initial steps of the government of intervention; in the Philippine Islands; and in South Africa. Has recently returned from a second visit to Cuba, made for the purpose of studying the work of the Cuban convention from the Cuban standpoint.

MR. HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST, a native of New York, is one of the best-known and ablest writers on political subjects at the National capital. For a number of years has occupied an editorial position on the Washington "Post," in charge of the Congressional and political work.

MR. JOHN P. YOUNG is managing editor of the San Francisco "Chronicle," a position he has filled since 1878. On the subject of Protection, has written quite prolifically for the "Chronicle" and other publications. Is the author of an extended paper on the subject of Oriental competition, which was printed as a United States Senate document. Also wrote a monograph on "Bimetallism or Monometallism," which has been widely quoted in and out of Congress. Mr. Young is a native of Pennsylvania, and in his youth attended the public schools in the city of Philadelphia. Embarked on his career of journalism in 1869, at the age of twenty, and has filled every position in the profession from office boy to editor.

THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXI, NO. 5.

JULY, 1901.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

**COPYRIGHT, 1900.
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.**

**PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
82, 84 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK**

The Forum

JULY, 1901.

A PLEA FOR THE INTEGRITY OF CHINA.

THERE has been recently manifested, among the powers forming the international convention, a disposition to pursue a policy of mild retrenchment in their dealings with China. It is true that this tendency has evoked a more or less denunciatory protest from Russia, whose attitude of rigorous harshness and exorbitant demands has been the one disturbing element in the concert. This attitude is all the more remarkable, since it contrasts so sharply with Russia's first policy of posing as the champion of China, and, in the initial discussions of the international convention, of urging a course of unparalleled mildness in subsequent relations with that empire. But to any one familiar with the subtle elements of Russian diplomacy the reasons governing this abrupt "about face" are not difficult to appreciate. The impassioned warning sent in March to Li Hung Chang, by M. de Giers, the Russian minister to Pekin, each word of which was freighted with the evidence of defeated ambition, has, or should have, shown to the interested powers that no faith can be safely placed in Russian official asseverations when interests which are solely and distinctively Russian are not served.

Russia has often complained that injustice has been done her by the Western nations who have been willing enough to believe the statements of England, Russia's arch-enemy, that the plighted word of the Russian government is not to be trusted. It is difficult, however, to see how Russia can palliate or explain away her radical and widely varying policies of almost absurd weakness and stern demands in the Chinese muddle; and it cannot be denied that she has only herself to blame if a

wrong construction has been popularly placed on the motives governing her negotiations. Nor need it cause surprise that her suspicious change of front, when defeated for the time in her Manchurian ambitions, is generally construed as an evidence that she has been playing a reprehensible double game with the allied powers for months past. If "by their fruits ye shall know them," then Russia has offered a masterpiece of diplomatic insincerity for the world's inspection.

All this is somewhat apart from the subject in hand; but it is of interest as showing that the coldness manifested by the international convention toward gratifying private revenge presages a milder and less coercive policy toward China. This more enlightened policy carries with it something of poetic justice. If in the first shock of indignation against China her complete subjugation and humiliation were the only objects sought, the lapse of time, bringing with it cool, sober-minded judgment, has led to a better understanding of the goading causes that provoked her militant defiance of the world, and a unanimous belief among all fair-minded critics that she has not been totally at fault. In fact, strive as we may to justify their existence, there are some things to be laid at the door of our vaunted civilization which do not show to advantage when considered without bias or blind partisanship. A proper appreciation of this fact will lead to a better understanding of what is to follow. Although, in dealing with the question of China, I write from the point of view of a friend of that nation, I do not wish it to be inferred that I am specially circumstanced in seeing the question merely from a Chinese standpoint.

The present state of China is suggestive of the Chinese puzzle, which, when it has been pulled to pieces, has to be put together again. At the outset a general disposition was shown among the interested powers to tear apart and scatter the pieces of China with a frenzied zeal which has only been equalled by their subsequent activity to reassemble these pieces and patch them together into some resemblance to the original. But, unfortunately, this satisfactory result has been rendered somewhat difficult from the fact that in the transition some of the pieces seem to have ~~got~~^{been} lost. One thing is plain, namely, that an exhibition of Christian civilization has been given which has been unexampled before. In the process of separating and putting together again, Russia has managed to appropriate a little piece on one side, and a large piece on the other; England has a piece, Germany has a piece, France has a piece; and while the United States has not shown a lust of territory, she demands the maintenance of an "open door" in China, unmindful of the fact that she

is slamming her own door in the face of the world. In all this sorry business the fact that some degree of justice entitles China's own views to consideration has been lost sight of in the policy of each for himself, seize what you can get, and the devil take the hindmost. Yet it might not be inapt to suggest, if the traditional methods of civilized procedure are to be followed, that China's own views are those entitled to chief recognition, even if it may not have occurred that the cry of "China for the Chinese" is not, after all, very different from the cries of "America for the Americans," "France for Frenchmen," "Germany for Germans," and "Russia for Russians."

Now that the motives governing, and the conditions leading up to, the Boxer outbreak of last summer may be viewed in a dispassionate retrospect, it is possible to gain a fuller and more satisfactory explanation of the fundamental causes of the tumultuary convulsion which roused the world, and which has made the political situation in China the point of white-heat interest. The origin of the Boxer movement has been ascribed to different causes. In turn, the abuse by missionaries of the privileges accorded them by the Chinese government, official jealousy of Christian proselytism, and the behavior of foreign nations in their treatment of China through their diplomatic representatives have been advanced as having an important bearing on the situation. It is to no one of these reasons, but rather to their combination, along with other disturbing causes of a secondary character, and the universal Chinese belief that the civilized powers are bent on the vivisection of their country, that may be attributed the truculent outbreak of the Boxers and the deep-rooted aversion of the Chinese to alien influences. The position of the Chinese is not difficult to understand, and their attitude is in nowise dissimilar from that which would be adopted by any other nation or individual person similarly circumstanced. If one had introduced a guest into one's house, and if, profiting by this advantage, that guest had manifested a disposition to appropriate one's property and personal belongings and to transgress all ethics of hospitality, one could be excused if outraged indignation prompted the turning out of that guest, neck and heels. The feelings which would govern an individual are but similar to those which have actuated China as a nation, and have prompted her to a policy for which she is now suffering political chastisement by the might that makes right.

To appreciate China's view of the situation and her full belief in the justice of her claims, it is necessary to review the sequence of events of which the Boxer outbreak was but the culminating point. To reach the

root of the question it would be necessary to go back to the initial concerted action which breached the wall of Chinese exclusiveness and antipathy to foreigners; but, for the question in hand, it is only necessary to antedate the present crisis by a few years, and recur to the assault made on Chinese integrity in 1897. Mention has been made already of the filching of small pieces of territory from China. The first movement of this kind, for which the German nation is responsible, occurred in November of that year, and consisted of the leasing or annexation, apparently synonymous terms, of the region opposite Japan, known as Kiaochoo. The place of itself was of no great commercial or strategical importance at the time, although the Chinese government had planned to build there a series of naval docks and shipyards, and to widen and improve the harbor. In the eager greed of commerce, there had been between the various nations of Europe and the United States a keen competition for getting what are called "markets" in China. Among strictly civilized nations, a trade intercourse of this character, even between the most strenuous commercial rivals, might be carried on for years, and perhaps centuries, without untoward conditions injecting themselves into the situation. Such conditions would not have developed in China, if at the very outset the diplomatic insincerity of the civilized powers had not been revealed in their thinly veiled attempts on China's territorial integrity. The *dénouement* was sudden, but not altogether unexpected. Germany was the first power to profit by it.

In November, 1897, two German missionaries were murdered in the vicinity of Kiaochoo Bay. Germany, seeing in this event an opportunity to steal a march upon her commercial rivals, by seizing upon it to her own advantage, made it the base upon which to erect demands, which, between two civilized powers, would have been looked upon as almost farcically outrageous and exorbitant, when the claim on which they were founded was taken into consideration. For this injury to German pride, Germany demanded the degradation of several important Chinese officials, although there was no evidence that the Chinese government had had anything to do with the outrage of which Germany complained; the erection of three churches at the cost of the Chinese government; and an indemnity to be paid to the families of the murdered missionaries. The latter demand was a just one, and received the sanction of the Chinese government. However, as the churches, which have been wittily termed by one supporter of China "Churches of the Holy Indemnity," were to cost 60,000 taels, and as the total indemnity would thus figure up to the respectable figure of \$160,000, the Chinese government naturally

showed considerable hesitation in immediately acquiescing in such an unwarrantable demand.

Accordingly, Germany, determined to risk all at one throw of the dice, instead of lessening the amount of her claims, added a rider securing to herself in preference to her commercial rivals the important advantage of bidding for the construction and maintenance of a railroad, if one should be required in that province. As an earnest of her intention to have these claims satisfied, without following the usual course of diplomatic procedure, with a suspicious promptness, and in defiance of all the ethics of international relations, she seized upon the port of Kiaochoo, expelled the Chinese commandant and other Chinese officials, and announced her intention of holding what she had seized until the demands which she had made had been settled. The vacillating Chinese government agreed to these demands. Germany was informed that they would be paid, and that full reparation would be made for the murder of the missionaries. But, instead of keeping her pledge to China that Kiaochoo would be evacuated when this concession was made, Germany followed up her first high-handed proceeding by a diplomatic manoeuvre which was worthy of the Middle Ages and for which there is no apology. Her demands were renewed, and this time she coolly asked that a guarantee should be given for the future. Nor was this the most insulting part of the proposition, as she specifically named what this compensatory safeguard should be, namely, the leasing of Kiaochoo Bay to Germany for a period of ninety-nine years, which was diplomatic language for the permanent territorial cession to Germany of Chinese soil. All this, it should be remembered, was the fair reparation, according to German belief, for the murder of two missionaries. A few hundred such convenient martyrs and the whole world would be in pawn to the Teuton!

Seeing the fruitful rewards of an energetic policy of bluff and coercion, and somewhat concerned lest, if she deferred action, her own share of the proceeds might be infinitesimal, Russia now took a hand in the game. In repeated protestations to the Chinese government she strove to show that, with Germany so favored, Russia should be given some territory by way of what she was pleased to call reparation or compensation. Bewildered by this new demand from an unexpected quarter, the Chinese government again showed a natural hesitation. Russia adopted practically the same policy as that pursued by Germany; laying sufficient stress upon her urgent "requests" to show that she was determined to see them fulfilled. Yielding to Russian influence, which is believed to be paramount in Pekin, and unwilling to arouse open antagonism, which might

be manifested, and, indeed, has actually been manifested since, on the Manchurian border, China, despite the protests of Japan, followed the easiest road out of the difficulty, and agreed to all that Russia demanded. Thus, without any reciprocal return, and without even the shallow substance upon which Germany had based her claims, Russia, at no greater inconvenience than a bullying policy of diplomatic coercion, secured Port Arthur and Talienshan under a lease of twenty-five years, with the even more valuable concessions of a right to run a railroad down from the north to these places, and to have this railroad guarded by Russian troops.

England, who had looked with disfavor on Germany's political juggling, and at the time had loudly protested against it, was electrified when the Russian demands were consummated, only a few weeks after the Kiaochoo affair. She could look upon the success of Germany with no more concern than at the prosperity of a commercial rival. In the case of Russia it was different. By the demands of Russia and their gratification she was hard hit, inasmuch as they marked one further step in Russian expansion, and a further strengthening of the forces of the hereditary Slavonic antagonist who is to dispute with her the political and commercial supremacy of Asia. The British government at once filed the most urgent protests against the granting of such powerful advantages to Russia. Lord Salisbury pointed out that the leasing of Port Arthur gave Russia a dominating authority in the councils of Pekin, and that it was unnecessary, inasmuch as Russia was co-terminous with China all through the north, and thus possessed as much power and influence with the Chinese court as she could really and reasonably expect. But, having the consent of China, and furthermore holding actual possession of her grant, Russia enjoyed the advantage which constitutes nine points of the law, and could well afford to snap her fingers at this disgruntled ebullition of diplomatic wrath in an opponent whom she designed to humble.

Seeing that there was no chance of dislodging Russia from her position of vantage, it was now necessary for England to safeguard her own interests and repair the damage by making a counter demand. The Chinese government, overruled by the dangerous precedents which by sheer, brutal, unrighteous force she had been compelled to establish, could find no satisfactory excuse to raise against this new demand; so without any trouble England secured the harbor of Weihaiwei, which shared to some extent the advantages of Port Arthur. Its strategic value was less than that of Port Arthur. It had no considerable docks or naval stations, and a large force would be required to defend it. But as no better prize was

left in the bag, England was, perforce, content with her acquisition. She had at least gained some advantage to check the complete success of her Slavonic rival. It may be urged, judging from our American standpoint, that England's motives are altruistic. She has never arrogated the right to enjoy in any part of her territory commercial advantages beyond those she has been willing to accord to other nations. Her absolute unselfishness in this respect is notorious; while with Russia and Germany, whose aims are distinctively national, there is a tendency to safeguard Russian and German interests, respectively, to the exclusion of all others. China, too, has less to fear from any British demands which are made upon her. In dealing with this subject, however, it is the principle of the thing which must be considered. England demands, or, if it will suit diplomatic usage better, let us say "requests," possession of Weihaiwei, without rendering an equivalent. China, in reality unwilling to do so, grants this claim, being governed by the same reasons which have led her to accede to the claims of Germany and Russia. In fact, she fears to antagonize the maker of this third demand. Her gift of a slice of her territory has not been gratuitous and of her own volition, but has been wrested from her by force, even if that force has been encased in a glove of diplomatic courtesy.

We may pass briefly over the demands made by Japan after the Chinese cession of Weihaiwei. Although her interests at stake have been as vital as those of the other powers concerned, throughout all this miserable business she has set the example of a lofty policy, both broad-minded and liberal, which the civilized nations might well have followed. Her defeat of China in the war with that country, and the belligerent hatred of the two nations, one for the other, might have led one to expect that Japan would demand cessions from a humiliated foe in reward for her passive acquiescence in cessions to powers whose claims on China were not as great as her own. Yet this heathen nation of Japan, with a chivalry almost inconceivable, unwilling to impose arbitrary conditions upon a foe toward whom she could afford to maintain a vigorous coercive policy, makes only the mild request that China shall never lease Fookien to any other power than Japan. Truly a magnanimity which, it is to be hoped, will ensure its own reward!

As it would be irreconcilable with the Gallic temperament to keep a finger out of the pie in which she shared an interest with her international neighbors, France looked about at this point to discover some means by which she could urge her claims to partake in China's generosity. Like Germany, she was fortunate in having missionaries who,

with commendable patriotic spirit, placed themselves in the way of being killed in order to simplify the situation. One of these worthy gentlemen, it so happened, was walking in the Chinese town of Kiangsi, when his glance was arrested by a placard, on one of the native houses, in which the Christian doctrine was treated with what, to him, seemed unnecessary harshness. In company with several native converts who accompanied him, he made an attempt to arrest the native who had posted the notice. The cries of the latter attracted the attention of his neighbors; a riot was provoked; and, in the *mélée*, unfortunately for himself, but fortunately, as it proved, for his government, the missionary was killed. In any civilized country such an affair would be settled simply. A court of inquiry would be held, the evidence of both sides would be heard, and the guilty parties would be punished.

But, in the hands of the proper master, such a simple incident as this can be forged into a lever that will upset mountains. France took advantage of this "happy" accident to make for herself some "happy" arrangements with China. The sorrowing relatives of the missionary were given a solatium of 100,000 francs; Christianity was solaced by the inevitable "Church of the Holy Indemnity"; and, these results having been attained, France took advantage of the occasion to secure some benefits to herself as a sort of profitable side-issue for the trouble involved in settling the weighty business of the death of one missionary in a native broil which he himself had provoked. That the trouble to which she had been put was not altogether unrewarded is shown by the fact that this incident enabled her to wrench from China a concession to construct a railway from Tonkin to Yuinnan-fu, with French capital and French engineers, a concession of another and shorter road from Kiangsi to Nanning, and the possession of the Bay of Kwang-chao-wan as a coaling-station. The latter place is of insignificant importance, but this does not lessen the fact that its cession was forced from China in a manner foreign to the dictates of justice and civilized procedure.

The Chinese government began at last to realize that, far from gaining the advantages she had looked for in following this vacillating policy — that is, of safeguarding her territorial and political integrity by conciliating those nations whom she had cause to fear — she had exposed herself to a constant renewal of demands and requests running through the whole gamut of possibility. To these were added various petty annoyances, not formidable in themselves, but all conspiring to stretch to the breaking-point even Chinese forbearance, patient and long-suffering as it is. For instance, France took advantage of her grant at Kwang-chao-

wan to hover about the island of Hainan. This was in itself an overt act of hostility, Hainan being Chinese territory, and was an aggression which, if it had been directed against any civilized power, would have demanded an apology or a declaration of war. Ignoring the protests of the local Chinese governor, French officers visited the island, inspected its harbor, proceeded into the country, and unmistakably and openly led local Chinese officials to believe that France intended to seize upon it at the first favorable opportunity. Let us imagine foreign officers coming into the United States in this way, and let us ask ourselves how long we should let them remain. Yet is the principle in any way different when we apply it to China?

One of the worst features of the situation is the wholly unscrupulous manner in which the civilized powers, by some strange method of reasoning, have followed a unanimous disposition to keep faith with China only so long as a pact of this sort suited their individual aims. This was shown more openly in the two years preceding the Boxer outbreak; for not only was there this general scramble in Pekin, but there was in addition a good deal of severe bullying with regard to railway, mining, and other concessions in the interior. Even England, whose attitude toward inferior peoples is not often open to criticism, seems to lend her countenance to a policy aiming at the utter humiliation of China; nor has she been one whit behind Russia, France, or Germany in trampling on every article in the code of international equity and fair dealing. From the point of view of the European or American trader, the concessions which England has wrung from China may prove beneficial in the long run to that country; but it does not alter the case that, in following this arbitrary method of procedure and in deciding herself what is best for China rather than consulting the views of the Chinese themselves, she has sacrificed on the altar of selfish personal ambition a moral obligation which she owes to civilization. This stricture can be applied with equal sincerity to the other civilized powers who have taken a hand in the spoiling of China.

The citation of a few of the more important events which antedated and led up to the Boxer outbreak, when considered in connection with the potent and more far-reaching influences which have been dilated on, will show how perfectly natural was this subsequent exposition of a truculent Chauvinistic spirit among the Chinese people as a whole. For instance, take England's "requests" for concessional advantages to run small steamers under her own flag on Chinese waterways, and parallel them with the imaginary case of any European nation demanding that ves-

sels flying her flag should control the bulk of traffic on the Mississippi or Missouri. In arousing popular and widespread indignation in China, minor considerations of this character had a more palpable effect than the mere cession of territorial rights on the sea-coast. The ordinary Chinese native, whose ambitions do not aspire higher than providing the means of existence for himself and his family from day to day, would not have troubled himself about these larger policies, even if he could have appreciated their menace. To him the inwardness of diplomatic jugglings was but a vague and uncertain element foreign to his crude understanding; a thing not to be seen in substance and grappled with; a thing, therefore, which to him had no existence. But the introduction of steamers by the "foreign devils" on the interior waterways was a menace at his very door, and one of which he had the evidence of his own eyes. He was not far-sighted enough to perceive that commercial industry would be augmented, and the demand for labor increased. He reasoned that if one steamer could perform the work of a dozen river-boats, the river-boats would have to go; and in this he saw the destruction of his own means of livelihood, with the result that his hatred of foreigners was fanned into an open flame. It cannot be rightly urged, if one is to believe in progression, that it would not be policy to introduce, even in the face of native opposition, the results of civilized endeavor which we know will enhance the prosperity of China by bringing to the rescue of her national resources the stimulation of modern enterprise. Nor have I sought to give this impression. A policy of abandoning China to herself, an attitude of *laissez aller*, would be a world calamity. What is wrong in principle is not the disposition of the civilized powers to exploit China commercially, but the method pursued in doing so. Naturally, if trade advantages are to be utilized by alien peoples for their own financial advantage, China may be excused for believing that she is entitled to some reciprocal return; to a fair share, at least, in the commercial co-partnership of which she is the producing factor, since the moral position of the alien partner is, or should be, merely one of sufferance.

If there were even a solitary instance of a desire among the powers to share justly with China the fruits of her exploitation, there would be in this altruistic policy not a little to commend. But the very course which has been pursued in the past by these civilized powers debars one from placing any faith in such an optimistic view of the future. Their general course right along has been to place China and Chinese interests in an inconspicuous position, and to withhold from her the proportionate

profits to which she is entitled under the generally understood terms of the joint contract. Can she be greatly blamed, therefore, if she compares herself with the hen which laid the golden eggs, and if she reads in this a doom as disastrous as that which overtook the fabled bird?

It would be a great mistake to underrate China, or to lose sight of her ability either to enhance the prosperity of the world or to give it a long period of perturbation. It is not a small nation, or one of political insignificance, that is to be taken into consideration; it is a question of conciliating or antagonizing one-third of the human race. A policy of coercion, and the relegation of Chinese rights to a place in the rear by the interested powers bent merely on profiting to their own advantage, may be temporarily fruitful; but there is a future to be reckoned with. China has not stood still; her dissatisfying experience with civilization has not been profitless; she has learned many a long lesson, and many a bitter one, from which she has not failed to extract elements which will work to her ultimate advantage. The Boxer movement would not have been possible twenty-five years ago. There then existed no certain cohesion between the varying elements of the empire, no nationality of spirit, no consolidated feeling of Chauvinism. The Boxer rising showed us what might be accomplished by this increasing power of consolidation, even in its primary stages. It marked an era of the awakening not merely of Chinese statesmen and politicians, but of China as a whole. While it was instigated and encouraged by the official class, which was thoroughly cognizant of all that was going on, it was a movement in which the common people took an intelligent interest; and the cry of "China for the Chinese" was the expression of a national sentiment, not a meaningless emanation from the mandarins in Pekin. It cannot be said, as regards the missionaries, that their teaching had the appreciable effect in stimulating the anti-foreign movement that has generally been supposed; they were martyrs rather to the belief which has taken hold of the Chinese, and which is not unwarranted by what has occurred in the past, that the civilized nations of the world are bent on their utter extinction as a nation.

I do not seek to apologize for, or to palliate, the barbarous ferocity of the retaliatory measures for which the Chinese government and the Chinese people, as represented by those who partook in the Boxer movement, are responsible. But if the reader has followed closely this review of the more important occurrences inimical to China's integrity which preceded and fomented the Boxer outbreak, I do not think I need comment on the enormity of these proceedings: all unbiassed and fair minds

must be revolted by such performances. Nothing more eloquent in denunciation of these doings could be offered than the mere recital of the circumstances themselves, which are related in the official blue-books covering the last five years. Is it not possible that a more neighborly charity, a stricter application of the principle of doing toward others as one would be done by, might have simplified the Christianizing and humanizing of China, and averted a catastrophe fraught with such terrible results? It is easy to decry Chinese cruelty and barbarity; but there is a maxim concerning the throwing of stones by people who live in glass houses. "Let the sleeping dog lie," runs the old proverb; and if by sundry proddings and torments one stirs the beast into retaliatory fury, the burden of blame for subsequent painful events must not rest on his head. This is a simile which, in my belief, explains the Chinese question in a nutshell. If we are tempted to heap opprobrium and contumely on China, we must remember that she was not the initial aggressor; that civilization forced itself upon her, and, by so doing, should have stood as her sponsor, and should have sought to dissipate her traditional antipathies by a discriminating example of moral rectitude and equitable relations. But do the incidents of the past show any inclination on the part of the powers to follow such an eminently just and charitable course? How, therefore, can the Chinese reason other than by the logic of events which have already happened? While civilization needed her aid in breaching the high walls of traditional anti-foreign spirit and exclusiveness, China was led to place faith in the sincere and charitable protestations of disinterested motives.

So the revulsion of Chinese feeling can be easily understood when subsequent diplomatic, commercial, and territorial aggressions, accompanied by an open course of coercion, revealed the real reasons which underlay this apparent solicitude for China's welfare. It is said that foreign diplomats thump the table when making their demands upon the Chinese government, and that on one occasion a Chinese mandarin was so impertinent that, when one of the foreign ministers thumped the table in his presence, he said: "Well, if that's your way, we can do that, too." So he pounded the table in good style. Imagine the belligerent sequence if a minister of a civilized nation were bulldozed and bullyragged in this manner by the official representative of another power who wished to lay before him a "request." In fact, if one gives to these instances their proper significance, one cannot but see that in a comparison of the equity and long-suffering forbearance of China with the inordinately selfish policy of her civilized spoliators, she shows up to conspicuous

advantage. The Chinese, heretofore, have not been a progressive people. But one can appreciate the resentment of the Chinese foreign office, composed of old-fashioned conservatives deeply steeped in Chinese ideas, when it understood properly the insincerity and double-dealing by which it was being duped. When these officials were rushed upon several times a day by foreign ministers, and had the tables vigorously thumped in front of them, it is small wonder that forbearance gave way to feelings of deep irritation, exasperation, and injured pride. It can be as easily understood that the news of this aggression upon China's integrity was soon widely disseminated among all classes, and that it provoked in the minds of the educated and patriotic Chinese and among the lower classes, who saw in it all a menace to their livelihood, a bitter and revengeful hatred, stimulating the powerful anti-foreign sentiment which made the Boxer uprising possible.

While it is impossible to remedy the mistakes of the past, it is possible, in formulating a policy to be adopted toward China in the future, to take advantage of the lessons which they have taught. The recent disposition of the powers to accord some consideration to the justice of the Chinese claims is a hopeful sign. It may, perhaps, indicate a growing belief among the powers in whose hands rests the fate of China that their attitude in the past has not been altogether blameless, and that in pursuing such a stringent policy they will not be subserving the best interests of the future. The pendulum has swung far in one direction; the moment is at hand when, logically, the counteracting influences of sober, reasonable second thought should cause a corresponding counter movement.

From what I know of China, I am certain that continued coercion and the ignoring of her rights will sow further seeds of distrust and hatred of all civilizing influences, and will prepare for a national uprising at some future date more terrible in its effects than a hundred combined Boxer outbreaks. The Chinese are not an assimilative people; they would not be absorbed by any nation, or nations, that might attempt to conquer and rule them. To a certain extent they are cohesive, their general interests being identical; and the partitioning of China and the drawing of territorial lines would not stifle racial sentiment. This sentiment, in fact, would only be accentuated and consolidated into a powerful political menace in the face of foreign aggression. Six hundred years ago, but for the death of Ogdoi, the son of the great Mongol khan, necessitating the recall of the great soldier Batu and his Mongol and Tartar hordes who invaded Europe, the whole course of the world's his-

tory would have been changed. That event did much to save Europe from the "yellow peril," as the battle of Lepanto prevented it from becoming Mohammedan. History is said to repeat itself. Can we, then, be certain that we are safe to-day from the swarming descendants of Ogdai and Batu when they are fully aroused? Even commercially and industrially they could swamp our labor markets, and, under another Batu, who might be found when occasion demanded, they could make the "yellow peril" again a real menace.

It would obviously be the wisest policy for the civilized powers to support the Chinese in maintaining the integrity, and assisting in the development, of their country. A politic eye to the future shows that the safest course is to lend a disinterested hand in increasing the power of China and augmenting her prosperity, in maintaining her present established political position, and in protecting her territory against any assault made upon it. With the exception of the Persians, the Chinese are the most actively intelligent of all races on the Asiatic continent, and possess considerable ability in administering their own affairs. Apart from political considerations, and assuming that China will be allowed to enter upon the path of national development, it will soon be shown that she has profited greatly by the injection of Western ideas and methods, from which not only she herself but the world at large will obtain reciprocal advantages. In the end, every nation will find that a merely commercial relation with China, rather than an active political interest in that country, will be fruitful of the best results.

I, for one, believe that the so-called anti-foreign sentiment of China is not so deeply rooted that it would not disappear before a policy of justice, equity, and liberality. If China can be made to believe that civilization is heartily ashamed of its conduct toward her in the past, and that in the future her interests are to be looked after as well as our own, we can safely rely on her assistance in furthering any scheme looking to progress in commerce and civilization. What is necessary, above all else, is to inspire confidence; to provide in visible form an example of our interest in her welfare; to make it clear that promises are concrete things, to be scrupulously regarded at all times, even when they may not for the moment promote our personal advantage; and to show that civilization is to be welcomed as a friend which, instead of menacing her existence, brings to her material advantages. If this policy is inaugurated and pursued strictly by the Western powers, I predict that the stimulus given to commercial and humanizing activity in China will be such as to startle even the most ardent optimists. It is mistrust alone

that begets mistrust, and it is mistrust alone that has restrained China from taking that position to which she is entitled by her geographical situation, by her size, and by her enormous natural resources. Remove the causes of that mistrust, and Chinese sentiment will be pliable to a *rapprochement* which will profit her and will enable the whole world to share equitably in her industrial exploitation.

American influence in the movements of the international convention can be made a powerful force in bringing about such inestimable results. The United States has never shown a disposition to meddle with, or disrupt, the Chinese political fabric. The people of China naturally feel most kindly toward Americans. Official and popular views harmonize in this respect. Deference would be shown by the powers to any suggestion of the United States looking to the maintenance of China's territorial and political integrity, and to an equal sharing of commercial development, without discrimination in favor of any one nation. The advocacy of such an attitude would meet with the cordial support of both England and Japan; and, with the international sentiment so acutely poised, such a combination would be of paramount importance in reaching a definite and lasting conclusion.

Let civilization humanize and modernize China; let it secure as a reward its fair share in the fruits of Chinese industrial resources; let it expand commercially as it will; but, above all else, let it be just.

W. C. JAMESON REID.

THE SALE OF TEXAS TO SPAIN: ITS BEARING ON OUR PRESENT PROBLEMS.

DURING the last three years a new phase of an old question has attracted general interest in this country. Stated in its most comprehensive terms, the question is: Have the President and the Senate, by treaty, or Congress and the President, by legislation, the constitutional power to control and deal with territory which is not a part of one of the States of the Union in a manner different from that in which they are bound by the Constitution to control and deal with the territory embraced in the several States?

This question is as old as the Constitution. It confronted the first Congress when it was called upon to legislate for the territory ceded by Great Britain, outside the limits of the original States. It next appeared, in another phase, when Jefferson, in order to protect our expanding commerce by securing control of the mouths of the Mississippi, purchased the province of Louisiana. Jefferson and the statesmen of his school originally thought that the Federal Government had no power, under the Constitution, to acquire territory beyond the limits fixed by the treaty of 1783. But when Monroe and Livingston, our representatives at Paris, reported that they had signed a treaty for the purchase of Louisiana, Jefferson urged his advisers in the Cabinet and his supporters in Congress to secure the immediate ratification of the treaty. He told senators and representatives to be brief in their discussions, and to treat the Constitution *sub silentio*.

The question presented itself in another phase in 1819, when Monroe was called upon to decide whether a part of the territory recently bought of France could be sold by the Federal Government. When Texas applied for admission to the Union, the question came up in still another form. In 1837, so wise and patriotic a statesman as John Quincy Adams offered in the House of Representatives this resolution:

“The power of annexing the people of any independent State to the Union is a power not delegated by the Constitution of the United States to their Congress, or to any department of their Government, but reserved to the people.”

In one form or another, this question of the powers of the Federal Government has been discussed at each new acquisition of territory.

Since the conclusion of the recent war with Spain, the question has come to the front in its latest phase. Under prominent leaders the people have taken opposite sides in their opinions as to the power of Congress to levy and collect, in the islands ceded by Spain, duties, imposts, and excises not uniform with those levied and collected in the United States. The general problem involves political, legal, and historical considerations. Congress assumed that it had such power when it passed the Porto Rican Tariff Act a year ago. At the election last November the people approved the exercise of this power; a few weeks ago the Supreme Court affirmed its constitutionality.

Under these circumstances, those who now add to their disapproval of the action of Congress and their condemnation of the verdict of the people their distrust of the wisdom and rectitude of the Supreme Court will hardly be persuaded though one rose from the dead. And yet, if the "Moses and the prophets" of their political faith should return from their graves to testify, they would bear witness that this power was now exercised in accordance with principles which they in their lifetime had uniformly approved. There is, for example, in our history, one chapter scarcely touched upon in the recent discussions of this question, which brings out with great clearness the views on this subject held by the early interpreters of the Constitution.

The sale of Texas is a luminous commentary on the interpretation given to the Federal Constitution by President Monroe and his contemporaries. Few now question the constitutional right of the Federal Government to acquire territory in any way recognized by international law; but opinions divide on the question of dealing with the territory after its acquisition. One school insists that all territory acquired by the Government becomes, immediately upon its acquisition, "an integral part" of the United States, and that its inhabitants become at once citizens of the United States. This is to contend that even where the Federal Government unwillingly acquires territory—for example, through war with a foreign power—the Constitution at once, silently and imperceptibly, through some mysterious force which is inherent in itself, envelops that territory like an atmosphere. One of the favorite expressions of this political school is that all property acquired by the Federal Government must be held in trust for future statehood. Now it has never been suggested that there is in the Constitution any authority, direct or implied, by which Congress, or any other department of the National Government,

can sell "an integral part" of the United States. If, therefore, territory lawfully acquired and held by the Government has been sold, this shows that those who made the sale did not consider that territory an integral part of the United States. The sale of Texas to Spain is, therefore, a strong historical argument against the theories of this school of transcendental statesmen.

In most of the discussions concerning the powers of the Federal Government in dealing with newly acquired territory, great confusion has arisen in the minds of speakers and writers, and consequently in the minds of their hearers or readers, through failure to distinguish between the different senses in which the words "the United States" are used in the Constitution and elsewhere. Let us take an illustration from two uses of these words in close proximity in the Constitution. It is provided, in Section 3 of Article II, that the President "shall commission all the officers of the United States." Section 1 of Article III provides thus:

"The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. The judges, both of the supreme and inferior courts, shall hold their offices during good behavior."

Congress has established courts in all the territories, the judges of which are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. These judges receive their commissions from the President, because they are officers of "the United States," that is, officers of the Nation. They do not hold office during good behavior, but are appointed for four years, because they are not a part of "the judicial power of the United States," that is, of the courts having jurisdiction over the territory and citizens of the several States of the Union.

The second paragraph of Section 3 of Article IV provides:

"The Congress shall have power to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory or other property belonging to the United States."

Here there is a clear division of territory into two kinds: (1) the territory included within and constituting "the United States;" and (2) other territory outside "the United States," but belonging to "the United States," and subject to the regulation and control of Congress. Now, when it is said, in Section 8 of Article I, that "all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States," there is nothing in the language or context to show that the words "the United States" have a signification different from that in Section 3 of Article IV, which

speaks of the territory included within the States of the Union. These illustrations are sufficient to show what erroneous conclusions may be reached by always attaching the same meaning to these three words.

President Monroe and his Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, who negotiated the treaty of 1819, and the senators who approved it, regarded the district between the Sabine and the Rio Grande, or Rio Bravo, as it was then called, as territory of the United States, in the sense that it was territory belonging to the United States. Many historians have made the mistake of commanding the treaty of 1819 as the settlement of a long-standing dispute between the United States and Spain as to the southwestern boundary. This is like approving such an adjustment of the Alaskan boundary dispute as would cede to Great Britain one-fourth of the territory of Alaska. But we are not now so much concerned in determining what were the merits of the respective claims of the United States and Spain as we are in ascertaining what Monroe, Adams, and their contemporaries, *thought* were the rights of the United States. A review of the events that led up to the treaty of 1819 shows that Monroe and his advisers held that Texas was included in the purchase of Louisiana from France, in 1803, and that the United States, nevertheless, could sell it to Spain, or to any other power.

By the middle of the eighteenth century the North American continent was divided between England, France, and Spain. France had Canada and the valleys of the Ohio and Mississippi. This great interior province, extending from the Rio Grande and the Rocky Mountains to the Alleghanies and the Lakes, was called Louisiana. Spain had the Floridas, Mexico, and the Pacific Coast. England had her thirteen colonies, with uncertain western boundaries merging into the eastern confines of Louisiana. Now, what was our chain of record title, as the lawyers would say, to Texas, when the treaty of 1819 was made, transferring this great province to Spain?

By a secret treaty, signed at Fontainebleau, November 3, 1762, France ceded to the King of Spain "and to his successors forever in full ownership and without any exception or reservation whatever all the country known under the name of Louisiana together with the island of New Orleans." This treaty was made in anticipation of the Peace of Paris, which terminated the long war waged on two continents between England and France. By this latter treaty, France ceded to England all her possessions in North America east of the Mississippi. By the treaty of 1783, concluding the War of Independence, the boundaries of the United States were fixed by the Lakes on the North and by the Mis-

sissippi on the West. Spain held the Floridas and Louisiana, and controlled the mouths of the Mississippi and of all the other rivers emptying into the Gulf of Mexico. These rivers were the highways by which the commerce of the Western States found an outlet. In 1795, Spain gave to the United States, by treaty, the free navigation of the Mississippi, and the right to deposit merchandise at New Orleans and transship it free of duty. This right of deposit was of the greatest value to the settlers west of the Alleghanies.

So matters stood when the second conveyance in our chain of title to Texas was made. By another secret treaty, signed at St. Ildefonso, October 1, 1800, Spain promised, upon the fulfilment of certain conditions, to retrocede to France "the colony or province of Louisiana with the same extent that it now has in the hands of Spain and that it had when France possessed it." Before Spain delivered Louisiana to France, she received from Napoleon the solemn assurance that he would not transfer the province to any other power. More than three years elapsed after the execution of the treaty of St. Ildefonso before France again took formal possession of her old province in North America. In the meantime, in October, 1802, the Spanish officer in charge at New Orleans had revoked the right of deposit and closed the mouths of the Mississippi to American commerce. This act set the country in a blaze, and even turned Jefferson from his "passion for peace" to the extent of contemplating an alliance with Great Britain.

Events now moved rapidly. Jefferson wrote to Livingston, our minister to France, to secure, if possible, from the First Consul a renewal of the right of deposit. If he could not get this concession, he was to try to buy the island of New Orleans. In January, 1803, Monroe was sent as special envoy to coöperate with Livingston. While they were negotiating with Talleyrand and Marbois, the rupture of the Peace of Amiens turned the thoughts of Napoleon from schemes of colonization in America to the more congenial theme of European war. He wanted money; the American commissioners wanted the mouths of the Mississippi. Napoleon abruptly changed front and offered them the mouths of the Mississippi, with all Louisiana thrown in. On May 2 the bargain was closed, and the treaty, dated April 30, was signed.

This is the third instrument in our chain of title. The treaty, after reciting the terms of the treaty of St. Ildefonso, proceeds:

"And whereas in pursuance of the treaty, and particularly of the third article, the French Republic has an incontestable title to the domain and to the possession of the said territory, the First Consul of the French Republic, desiring to give to the

United States a strong proof of his friendship, doth hereby cede to the said United States in the name of the French Republic forever and in full sovereignty the said territory with all its rights and appurtenances as fully and in the same manner as they have been acquired by the French Republic in virtue of the above-mentioned treaty concluded with his Catholic Majesty."

On November 30, 1803, Spain delivered Louisiana back to France; and, on December 20, at New Orleans, Claiborne and Wilkinson, representing the United States, received a formal transfer of the province from Laussat, who, twenty days before, had received it from Spain. By this treaty the United States acquired title to all the territory held by France west of the Mississippi prior to 1762. For reasons known only to himself, Napoleon refused to give any precise boundaries to Louisiana in the treaty with the United States, although more than a year before he had given to Victor and Laussat, who were to receive the province from Spain, secret written instructions accurately describing the limits of the province. Before 1762 Spain and France had not agreed upon any boundary between their possessions on the Gulf. From that date to 1803, while Spain held Louisiana, the question of its western boundary of course did not arise. When we acquired possession of the territory, it became necessary to determine at once the extent of our jurisdiction. This led to a dispute with Spain.

The sale of Louisiana was an act of perfidy toward Spain on the part of Napoleon, but we knew nothing of his secret pledge to Spain until after our treaty with France had been published. We were entitled to rely on the warranty of France. Spain protested vigorously against the alienation by France of any part of Louisiana, and insisted that the United States acquired no title to any portion of that territory. So far as France was concerned Spain protested in vain. The Spanish ministers were clay in the hands of Napoleon. Spain, therefore, transferred her remonstrances to the United States, confining them eventually to the claim that the western boundary of Louisiana was somewhere north and east of the Rio Grande. Napoleon was now involved in a war with Great Britain. Notwithstanding his written instructions to Victor, he was willing, as a means of placating Spain, to encourage her in this claim against the United States. These instructions, which were to be presented to the Spanish Captain-General, Somoruelos, who was to deliver over the province on behalf of Spain, gave by exact description the extent of Louisiana as it was to be returned to France, and fixed the Rio Grande as its western boundary.

Although the language of these instructions was not known to Jefferson or to the ministers of the United States, they knew from other

sources that the French possessions extended to the Rio Grande. To the distinguished American historian, Henry Adams, a grandson of Monroe's Secretary of State, belongs the credit of discovering these secret instructions in manuscript in the *Archives de la Marine*, at Paris. They prove beyond question that France and Spain had agreed upon the Rio Grande as the dividing line between their possessions on the Gulf of Mexico, and, hence, that Texas was included in the province of Louisiana sold by Napoleon to the United States. It was only with the encouragement of Napoleon that Spain dared to contend for a boundary farther east. Jefferson knew that Texas was included in the purchase, and, had he not been so completely dominated by French influences, he would have compelled Spain to recognize the Rio Grande as the western boundary of the United States; but he had secured control of the Mississippi, had added an empire to the Union, and, with his passion for peace, a mere trifle of three or four hundred thousand square miles did not seem worth making a fuss over. Accordingly, he tried by peaceful means to induce Spain to recognize our claims, but without success; and, in 1808, diplomatic relations between the two countries were broken off.

When intercourse was resumed, by the sending of Don Luis de Onis as Spanish Minister to this country, in 1815, Madison was President and Monroe Secretary of State. An old cause of difference between the two countries had now assumed greater importance than the western boundary question. Spain still held East and West Florida. Since the adoption of the Constitution it had been evident that, sooner or later, this territory must belong to the United States. The rivers which bore the products of the Southern States, destined for the markets of the world, flowed through Spanish territory. West Florida had become the retreat of pirates, lawless adventurers, and hostile Indians, who made frequent predatory incursions into American territory and attacks upon our commerce. Spain was unable to suppress these outlaws, and the acquisition of the Floridas was demanded by the people of the South as an act of self-protection.

Negotiations for the exchange of Texas for the Floridas now began, and continued for over five years. On February 22, 1819, John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, and Luis de Onis, Spanish Minister, signed at Washington a treaty by which Spain ceded the Floridas to the United States; and the boundary line between the two countries, west of the Mississippi, was fixed at the River Sabine:

"The Two High Contracting Parties agree to cede and renounce all their rights, claims and pretensions to the territories described by the same Line; that is to say,

the United States hereby cede to His Catholic Majesty, and renounce forever, all their rights, claims, and pretensions to the Territories lying West and South of the above-described Line."

This was by its terms a treaty of cession. Each party renounced the claims of its citizens against the other, and the United States agreed to appropriate a sum not to exceed \$5,000,000 for the payment of claims of her citizens against Spain. If we suppose that the claims of Spanish citizens against the United States were equal to this amount — and, when we consider the expedition of the *Miranda* and Jackson's excursions in western Florida, they could hardly have been less — then the treaty of 1819 was simply an exchange of Texas for Florida. The instrument itself is conclusive proof that we owned Texas, and that Spain did not. Spain had not then been reduced to the extremity of parting with valuable possessions to an eager purchaser for the mere satisfaction of having a boundary-line definitively established. If we had been driving a hard trade with such a helpless power, we should have put the boundary at the Rio Grande. As it was, we felt that we were dealing fairly in the matter, and Spain felt that she was not getting the worst of the bargain. If we did not sell Texas to Spain, then Spain gave us Florida for nothing.

Since the discoveries of Henry Adams were published in his "History of the United States," nothing new has been added to the story of the sale of Texas. It is a chapter in our national annals to which we revert with little satisfaction and no pride. The transaction assumes a new interest and importance at this time on account of its bearing upon the questions now occupying the public mind respecting the authority of the Federal Government over the islands ceded by Spain. Did Monroe and Adams, and the Congress that approved the treaty of 1819, regard Texas as territory belonging to the United States? No man living at the time knew so much about the purchase of Louisiana, and the facts connected with its subsequent history, as did Monroe. He had been special envoy to France, and, as such, had signed the treaty of purchase. He had been sent on a special mission to Madrid, in 1805, to settle the boundary dispute with Spain. As Secretary of State, he had begun the negotiations which resulted in the treaty which he signed as President. When, as Secretary of State, he wrote to Onis, on June 10, 1816, he expressed not only his own views, but those, also, of President Madison, of Livingston, his colleague at Paris in 1803, and of Jefferson, under whose instructions he was then acting. In his letter to the Spanish Minister he said:

"With respect to the western boundary of Louisiana, I have to remark that this

government has never doubted, since the treaty of 1803, that it extended to the Rio Bravo."

Adams took up the correspondence with Onis where Monroe left off, when the latter became President. Their negotiations lasted until the treaty was signed, and cover nearly two hundred quarto pages of the American State Papers. Onis claimed the Mississippi as the eastern boundary of the Spanish possessions. Adams insisted on the Rio Bravo, and thus summed up his arguments in a letter dated March 12, 1818:

"Well might Messrs. Pinckney and Monroe write to Mr. Cevallos, in 1805, that the claim of the United States to the boundary of the Rio Bravo was as clear as their right to the island of New Orleans."

In his annual message of December 7, 1819, President Monroe, in commenting on the failure of Spain to ratify the treaty, said:

"For territory ceded by Spain, other territory of great value, to which our claim was believed to be well founded, was ceded by the United States, and in a quarter more interesting to her."

Onis was recalled in 1820 and was succeeded by General Vives. Adams was of the opinion that the new minister ought to have brought the king's ratification of the treaty; and, when he learned that he had not done so, he wrote to Vives, on April 21, expressing his surprise, and accusing the Spanish sovereign of bad faith. His patience was exhausted, and he was quite ready to declare war, take the Floridas, and collect the claims of United States citizens by force. On May 2 he closed a letter to Vives with these ominous words:

"Their right of territory was, and yet is, to the Rio del Norte. I am instructed to declare that, if any further delay to the ratification by His Catholic Majesty of the treaty should occur, the United States could not hereafter accept either of \$5,000,-000 for the indemnities due to their citizens by Spain, nor of the Sabine for the boundary between the United States and the Spanish territories."

The treaty of 1819 received the unanimous approval of the Senate when it first came before that body; and, on its final consideration, in 1821, only four votes were cast against it. In the House, the legislation for carrying the treaty into effect was passed without even a division. Henry Clay, who was then Speaker, opposed the treaty because Florida was not an adequate consideration for Texas, and because Congress, not the President and Senate, had the constitutional power to alienate territory. He introduced in the House the following resolutions:

"1. Resolved, That the Constitution of the United States vests in Congress the power to dispose of territory belonging to them, and that no treaty, purporting to alienate any portion thereof, is valid without the concurrence of Congress.

2. Resolved, That the equivalent proposed to be given by Spain, to the United

States, in the treaty, concluded between them, on the 22d day of February, 1819, for that part of Louisiana lying west of the Sabine, was inadequate; and that it would be inexpedient to make a transfer thereof to any foreign power, or renew the aforesaid treaty."

In speaking to these resolutions Mr. Clay said:

"In the case of the Florida Treaty it was not pretended that the object was simply a declaration where the western boundary of Louisiana was; it was, on the contrary, the case of an avowed cession of territory from the United States to Spain."

He presumed that the spectacle would not be presented of questioning in that branch of the Government our title to Texas, which had been constantly maintained by the Executive for more than fifteen years past, under three several administrations. He was, at the same time, ready and prepared to make out our title if any in the House were fearless enough to controvert it.

Throughout the country, the purchase of Florida met with general approval; and, as it was effected by the sale of Texas, the latter was, at least, not unpopular. The only objection to the acquisition of Florida was that it increased the slave territory of the Union; and the people of the North were glad to waive this objection in view of the alienation of Southern territory six times the extent of Florida. The Southern people looked complacently upon the sale of Texas, because, with Monroe, they believed that, sooner or later, it would return. And so the treaty of 1819 made Monroe the most popular man in the country, and made Adams a presidential possibility. At the election of 1820 Monroe received every vote but one in the Electoral College, and in 1825 Adams became President.

In considering Monroe's conception of the powers of the Federal Government to alienate territory, it is important to note his reason for selecting the Sabine as the eastern boundary of the district sold to Spain, a boundary which had never been contended for by either party. In 1812 Louisiana had been admitted into the Union as a State, with the Sabine River and the 94th meridian as her western boundary. There was no significance at that time in the selection of this line. It might just as well have been the Trinity River and the 95th meridian, or the Brazos River and the 96th meridian. Now, when Adams came to agree with Onis on the extent of the territory to be ceded to Spain, although Onis insisted on a boundary east of the Sabine, Adams would not even listen to such a proposition. He drew a sharp distinction between the powers of the Federal Government over territory incorporated into the Union as part of a State, and territory belonging to the United States,

but outside the limits of any State. The Sabine, therefore, was as far east as Monroe and Adams thought they had the power to go.

Even the Spanish minister, who had fought so valiantly with his pen in the contention that the United States did not own Texas, gracefully admitted, after the conflict was over and the treaty had been signed, that, in making the claims he did, he was simply fighting to get all the territory he could for his sovereign, and that he thought Spain fared well in securing Texas. After his return to Madrid he published a pamphlet, entitled "Memoir upon the Negotiations between Spain and the United States of America, which led to the Treaty of 1819." In explaining what he had accomplished, he said:

"An impartial public will judge whether the Treaty of the 22d of February, 1819, (which is improperly called a treaty of cession, as it is in reality one of exchange or permutation of one small province for another of double the extent, richer and more fertile,) deserves the epithet of disgraceful. . . . I will agree, however, that for greater perspicuity, I might have extended the 3d article in the following terms: 'In exchange, the United States cede to his Majesty the province of Texas, etc.,' as the Government wished me to express it; but as I had, in the correspondence for three years, contended that the province belonged to the King, it would have been a contradiction to say in the treaty that the United States ceded it to his Majesty, the same thing being obtained by the terms in which it is expressed."

President Polk gave a more careful study to the history of the sale of Texas than any other of our statesmen since the time of Monroe and Adams. In his inaugural address he said: "Texas was once a part of our country . . . was unwisely ceded away to a foreign power." In his second annual message, he said: "Down to the conclusion of the treaty, in February, 1819, by which this territory was ceded to Spain, the United States asserted and maintained their territorial rights to this extent" — that is, to the Rio Grande. In both these documents he refers to the admission of the young republic as the "reunion," or "reannexation," of Texas.

The country to-day is facing the same problem that perplexed Jefferson and Monroe. The question which confronts us is: What are the powers of the Federal Government over the islands ceded by Spain to the United States? The problem that confronted Monroe was: What are the powers of the Federal Government over the territory ceded to the United States by France? In deciding this question, Monroe and the statesmen of his time made, in the first place, a clear distinction between territory incorporated into the Union as part of one of the several States, and territory outside the limits of any State, but belonging to the United States. It was held that territory outside the limits of the States, and belonging to the United States, could be regulated and disposed of by the

Federal Government, regardless of the limitations and restrictions of the Constitution. In accordance with this principle, Monroe and the officers of his Administration, Congress, and the people generally believed that the President and Senate, by treaty, could sell such territory and expatriate the inhabitants thereof.

It is a singular fact that the only alienation of United States territory to a European monarch should have been made by that President who, a few years thereafter, gave his name to the popular American doctrine that the extension of sovereignty by a European monarch over territory on the American continent would be looked upon as an unfriendly act by the United States. The principle on which Monroe acted, in 1819, would to-day authorize the President and Senate to sell Alaska to Great Britain, Arizona to Mexico, or the Philippine Islands to Germany. We may be sure, however, that this principle will never be invoked for the purpose of selling territory of the United States on this continent to any European power; for the Monroe doctrine of 1823, that the American continent is for American republics, now controls the Monroe doctrine of 1819.

In case it should again seem wise or expedient to dispose of any national territory, Clay's contention would undoubtedly prevail, that the right of alienation of property belonging to the United States is vested in Congress, and not in the treaty-making power. Nevertheless, the sale of Texas still remains an unviolated historical precedent in support of the contention that the Federal Government has the absolute power to acquire territory outside the Union, and to regulate and dispose of it, independently of the provisions of the Constitution relating to territory incorporated into the Union. The recent decision of the Supreme Court in the Porto Rican tariff cases is in harmony with this precedent, although the views of Monroe and his contemporaries and the significance of the sale of Texas are not alluded to in the briefs of counsel or in the opinion of the court.

HENRY SHERMAN BOUTELL.

MEDICAL PRACTICE AND THE LAW.

DURING the present year public attention has been directed to the legislatures of seven States where vigorous contests have arisen over efforts to pass laws defining the practice of medicine. These States are New York, Missouri, Massachusetts, Kentucky, Alabama, Indiana, and California. In Missouri, Indiana, and California these efforts were successful, and partially so in Alabama; but in New York and Kentucky the battle must again be waged before subsequent legislatures, as it must be waged in all the other States where no adequate definition exists either by statute or judicial interpretation. Not only have the legislatures been called upon to settle this mooted question, but in various ways the fight has been carried into the courts of many States, notably Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Georgia.

The purpose of this article is to outline briefly the present status of the so-called "medical practice acts"; to emphasize the urgent need for an adequate definition of the practice of medicine as a necessary part of these acts; to suggest the correct legal principle underlying and justifying such a definition; and to show the fallacious nature of the objections urged against it by those who would be driven out of business by its adoption.

For a long time the medical profession declined to lead in the agitation for rigid restrictions of medical practice. Even now some physicians contend that they are not interested in suppressing quacks. But as illegal practice came more and more to be a serious public menace, the great body of the profession stepped as usual into the breach and began the battle for the protection of the public health.

The physician, being fully equipped to defend himself and his family against the dangers of ignorant healers, is affected least of all by the failure of the State to exclude the latter from indiscriminate practice; yet, in accordance with the tradition of his self-sacrificing and heroic profession, and because of his superior skill and knowledge, the public looks to him to direct the struggle for the preservation of the public health. In his demand for an adequate legal definition of his science, the physician should be supported by every profession; for the same public policy

that upholds the right of the State to exclude the ignorant from treating the sick also upholds the right to exclude the ignorant from practising law, chemistry, engineering, navigation, plumbing, in fact, all professions and trades where knowledge and skill are necessary. All these trades and professions are regulated not for the purpose of creating a monopoly for those who enter them in accordance with the law, but to protect the persons and property of the public, which should at all times be the chief solicitude of every conscientious legislator.

Few civilized countries permit the indiscriminate practice of medicine. Generally speaking, it is almost universal to require every practitioner of this science to pass successfully an examination in its numerous branches, and to register the license which he obtains as a result thereof. In the more enlightened countries the practitioner must possess as well a common-school education, and in addition be a man whose moral qualifications are properly vouched for. Provisions are made for a public registration of the license obtained from the State, and it is usually made a misdemeanor to practise without the required registration. Acts of this character, while really a part of the public health laws, are generally known as "medical practice acts." It will be noted that they do not prescribe what means or methods a man shall use in treating the sick. No particular school or theory of medicine is favored or endorsed. These laws merely require the applicant for a license to show the requisite knowledge of disease, its cause, its cure, etc., before he is permitted to practise in any manner. In a word, they demand nothing more or less than an educational qualification from all those who seek to practise a profession in which education is preëminently an essential.

To dwell upon the dangers incident to the indiscriminate practice of unqualified practitioners is to advance again the unanswerable arguments which served to bring about the medical practice acts in the first instance. Courts of last resort everywhere have pointed out these dangers, and have declared that public policy demands their suppression by an exercise of the police powers of the State. If there is no fixed standard of education and knowledge for those who undertake to heal disease, the citizen is left at the mercy of any incompetent person who, preying upon the gullibility and ignorance of the sick and despondent, replete his own pocket-book while he depletes the health and fortune of his victims. The purity and sanctity of the fireside and sick-room are not protected from invasion; for the unlicensed practitioner is at liberty to ignore the mental and moral qualifications demanded by all medical practice acts. Worst of all, helpless children and invalids are left a prey to the charla-

tan, with his cure-all nostrums or his *laissez faire* denial of disease and pain. It is a well-known fact that some insurance organizations are making it very difficult for Christian Scientists to obtain life insurance. The State should protect its citizens no less zealously than the insurance companies their treasures.

Since, then, the State has thus sought, in the interest of the public health, to make a knowledge of disease a pre-requisite for the practice of medicine, why are Christian Scientists, osteopaths, vitopaths, hydropaths, clairvoyants, and scores of other pseudo-scientists, without skill and knowledge in the treatment of disease, permitted to practise in what seems to be an open disregard of the medical laws?

The question turns upon what is, in law, the practice of medicine. Before a punishment can be inflicted for irregular practice, it is necessary to determine what the law considers irregular practice. It would seem, on general principles, that any one who professes to heal the sick is professing to be a physician, and that any one who gives treatment for the cure of disease is practising medicine. Many of the States, either by express statutory enactment or by judicial interpretation, have taken this natural and rational view of the science of medicine. Some courts, however, in the absence of an express enactment to the contrary, have inclined to look upon "the application and use of medicine and drugs" as the criterion by which the representatives of the law shall determine what is the practice of medicine.

This narrow view of the healing art is utterly at variance with its present advanced state. The practice of medicine is not the practice of any particular means or method of healing, but has reference (1) to the proper diagnosis of disease, and (2) to the practice of all means for its alleviation and cure. The medical schools of to-day reject no methods or agents that have any known efficacy in relieving suffering. Mind cure, hypnotism, massage, and electricity all have their uses in the comprehensive science of medicine; but the physician, with his scientific analysis and unbiassed judgment, refuses to become a charlatan and say that any one of these methods is the only cure in the treatment of disease. Neither does he say that the use of drugs and medicines is always essential. Indeed, when *not* to use them is a most important part of his knowledge. Each discovery made by modern science that promises to lessen the sum of human suffering is eagerly investigated by medical men; and if, after an experiment, it is found to be of real value, it is published to the world, and henceforth takes its place as one of the remedies employed by the practitioner of medicine.

The best lexicographers have realized this broad view of the science of medicine. The Standard Dictionary defines "medicine" as "The healing art; the science of the preservation of health and of treating disease for the purpose of cure." The Century Dictionary gives this definition: "The art of preventing, curing, or alleviating diseases, and remedying as far as possible the results of violence and accident."

Wherever the courts have taken a less comprehensive view of the healing art, and have declared that no one practises medicine unless he gives drugs, a most unfortunate state of affairs is found to exist. A Christian Scientist may put out a shingle as a Christian Science doctor, and give "treatment," either present or "absent," to every one willing to pay the required fee. He—or more often she—may practise upon young children with contagious diseases, or upon imbeciles with vacant minds; he may loudly proclaim ability to heal, and yet, forsooth, because no drugs are given, he is not liable to punishment for practising medicine. The osteopath can boast of his perfect system of anatomy, diagnosis, and treatment, and he, too, can be known as "doctor," and go about practising upon the sick without fear, merely because, to evade the law, he proclaims the harmfulness of drugs. And so, in those States where no adequate definition exists, we find that scores of quacks, driven from the use of drugs, now ply their trade under some other guise and behind some high-sounding name.

A directory of the aliases thus assumed by the old-time drug charlatan must needs be revised daily; for many fertile brains are busy coining them, and many people, not all of them weak and helpless, are willing to believe the stories of marvellous cures wrought "without the aid of drugs after the doctor had given up the patient." In those unfortunate States where such a condition exists, it is no wonder that a demand should go up for a definition that will apply to all healers of disease.

The definition just passed by the legislature of Indiana provides:

"To heal, cure, or relieve, or to attempt to heal, cure, or relieve those suffering from injury or deformity, or disease of mind or body, or to advertise or to announce to the public in any manner a readiness or ability to heal, cure, or relieve those who may be suffering from injury, or deformity, or disease of mind or body, shall be to engage in the practice of medicine within the meaning of this act."

Judge Martin, of Bedford, Indiana, the first judge to pass upon this law, has very recently upheld it in a case brought against a certain "magnetic healer."

The recent California act declares, among other things:

"Those who profess to be, or hold themselves out as being, engaged as doctors, physicians, or surgeons in the treatment of disease, injury, or deformity of human

beings, or those who for pecuniary or valuable consideration shall prescribe medicine, magnetism, or electricity in the treatment of disease, injury, or deformity of human beings shall be deemed as practising medicine."

The Missouri act, also passed at the last session of the General Assembly of that State, provides:

"It shall be unlawful for any person not now a registered physician within the meaning of the law to practise medicine or surgery in any of its departments, or to profess to cure and attempt to treat the sick and others affected with bodily or mental infirmities."

At the session of the New York legislature just closed, an effort was made by the Medical Society of the State of New York to secure the passing of a definition embodying the principles quoted above. In view of the great need for such a definition the effort to pass such a law is not surprising. What is surprising is that intelligent people could be induced to raise their voices in opposition, and that legislatures would listen to their clamor while turning a deaf ear to the cries of those who suffered from their failure to act. The clairvoyants, hydropaths, and many others with names even more fearful and impressive were on hand to abuse the accumulated wisdom of ages as represented by the regular school of medicine, and to claim for their individual methods a monopoly of efficacy and power.

The osteopaths made up in energy what they lacked in numbers and logic, and were brought forward into the public gaze through the supposed advocacy of their cause by no less a personage than Mr. Samuel L. Clemens, better known as "Mark Twain." The osteopath differs from the other opponents of regular medical practice in claiming a scientific basis for his science. His theory is, briefly stated, that disease results from a displacement of the bones, muscles, and nerves of the body. The original school of osteopathy, located in a Western State, claims to have a regular system of education, and to teach the peculiar methods of osteopathy on a scientific basis, after the fashion of other schools. Indeed, the devotees of this system insisted that their claims were capable of much more accurate demonstration than those of the regular profession.

This being so, it was pointed out to them that the proposed bill simply required practitioners of the healing art to take a four-year course, and to pass a successful examination at the end thereof. The osteopaths were then asked why they objected to this educational requirement, and why they should be permitted to practise their "comprehensive science" after a course of a few years in a Western school, when the law required the regular practitioner to take a four-year course in some school recognized by the Regents of the University of the State of New York.

This brought their claims perilously near the *reductio ad absurdum*. It was seen that their effort to gain recognition was in effect an attack on the high standard of education which New York has erected after many years of agitation. Such an illogical and unfair position could not be maintained successfully; and their demand for recognition, on the terms proposed, met a prompt refusal at the hands of the legislators, in spite of the fact that some States with lax medical laws have legalized their practice. Mr. Clemens was frank enough to say:

"I don't know that I cared much about these osteopaths until I heard you were going to drive them out of the State; but since I heard that I haven't been able to sleep."

His plea was not a plea for osteopathy, as its champions had hoped, but a plea for what he was pleased to term "personal liberty." He said in this connection:

"Now, what I contend is that my body is my own, at least I have always so regarded it. If I do harm through my experimenting with it, it is I who suffer, not the State."

This argument entirely ignores the point at issue. The idea is not to prevent a man from doing what he wishes with his own, so much as to prevent the charlatan from doing what he pleases with the bodies and pockets of others. As was well said in an effective reply to this contention:

"If a jaunty experimenter in everything that comes along should choose to indulge in the throwing of lighted torches upon the roofs of his neighbors' houses, doubtless the strong hand of the law would promptly step in and stop him from trying at least that particular experiment. But if he calls to his child's sick-bed a person who has been in no way qualified to recognize disease, he is putting his neighbor's life into quite a serious danger. Yet in the latter case let the strong hand of the law step in, and at once the air is full of rodomontades on the sacredness of personal liberty. Is this jaunty experimenter to be permitted to give everything a chance, even the deadly microbe of scarlet fever, typhus, and smallpox?"

It seems difficult to imagine how an educational qualification for the practice of a learned profession can be considered an invasion of personal liberty. Every lawyer knows that the courts, without exception, have upheld medical practice acts when attacked as unconstitutional on this as well as on other grounds. As was said by the New York Court of Appeals (*People vs. Hawker*, 152 N. Y. 241):

"The Constitution provides that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; yet this provision of the organic law is made subordinate to that of paramount necessity, and the rights secured thereby to the citizens must yield to that of the preservation of the public health. The legislature,

therefore, in the exercise of its discretion under the police powers of the State may, by act, impose reasonable conditions and requirements under which individuals may practise the profession of medicine, and to restrain and prohibit all persons not complying therewith from engaging in such practice."

The osteopaths and other irregular practitioners were aided by the religious sect commonly known as Christian Scientists. The physician rejects no known remedy in his fight against disease: this sect rejects all. No wonder it has been said of them that "they are neither scientific nor Christian."

The grounds of their opposition were many. Among other things, they very seriously contended that if they were required to study the laws of disease and how to diagnose it, they could not retain the mental and spiritual frame of thought necessary for the practice of their own methods. It may be suggested, in passing, that dangerous and unreasonable practices usually disappear when enlightenment and study begin. But ostensibly their chief opposition was on the ground that to prohibit their practice was to prohibit a free exercise of religious liberty guaranteed by the Constitution. A most sacred plea this! The shrewdness of the Christian Scientists has been shown in nothing more than in the persistence with which they have advanced this argument. In America, essentially a liberty-loving country, official intolerance and interference with religious liberty will never, let us hope, be countenanced by any legislature or any court.

But can it be said that the State, in denying Christian Scientists the right to heal the sick before qualifying themselves for such practice, is depriving them of religious liberty?

The Supreme Court of the United States has said (*Davis vs. Beason*, 133 U. S. 333):

"The term religion has reference to one's views of his relations to his Creator, and to the obligations they impose of reverence for His being and character and of obedience to His will. It is often confounded with the *cultus* or form of worship of a particular sect, but it is distinguishable from the latter. It was never intended or supposed that the Constitution could be invoked as a protection against legislation for the punishment of acts inimical to the peace, good order, and morals of society. . . . However free the exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to the criminal laws of the country, passed with reference to actions regarded by general consent as properly the subject of punitive legislation."

And the same court, in again discussing the right of a polygamist to escape the law against plural marriage, on the theory that his religious liberty was invaded, said:

"Laws are made for the government of actions, and, while they cannot interfere with mere religious beliefs and opinions, they may with practices.

Suppose that one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent a sacrifice?

Or if a wife religiously believed it was her duty to burn herself upon the funeral pile of her dead husband, would it be beyond the power of civil government to prevent her carrying her belief into practice?"

In a recent case in Pennsylvania the courts of that State passed upon this very point, in refusing to grant a charter to Christian Scientists as a religious corporation. The court said:

"If the purpose of the proposed corporation were only to include a creed, or to promulgate a form of worship, no question could arise, . . . but the most cursory examination of the tenets and of the books . . . shows an effort to establish a prescribed method of practising the art of healing the diseases of the body. . . . The treatment extends to the most serious and fatal of diseases (quoting 'Science and Health,' 422). 'If the case to be mentally treated is consumption, take up the leading points included, according to belief, in that disease. Show that it is not inherited; that inflammation, tubercles, hemorrhage, and decomposition are beliefs. Then these ills will disappear.' If the lungs are disappearing, this is but one of the beliefs of mortal mind. It is quite clear, therefore, that what is proposed is much more than a church, since there is besides to be established a system for the treatment of disease."

The most recent pronouncement of our courts on the subject is a very learned and scholarly opinion of Judge Lumpkin, a judge of the Superior Court of Georgia. He decided that, under the Georgia definition, the practice of Christian Science was the practice of medicine, and that to prohibit this practice was not an infringement of religious liberty.

Within the last twelve months, two women were arrested in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, under the medical practice acts of that State. These women had administered the so-called Christian Science treatment to an eleven-year-old girl suffering from diphtheria. She died in a few hours after being placed in the hands of the "healers." The defendants were found guilty; and Judge N. B. Neelen, in delivering the opinion of the court, said in part as follows:

"Christian Science is, then, at the same time a religious belief and a system for the cure of diseases. As far as Christian Scientists constitute a religious body, they are entitled to be treated with perfect toleration, and to have entire freedom to hold and teach their doctrine; but when the professors of these doctrines hold themselves as able to heal physical ailments, the question arises whether they render themselves amenable to the laws regulating the practice of medicine.

Under existing laws to heal the sick or, to use equivalent words, 'to practise medicine,' is not construed by the courts as applying exclusively to the administration of drugs and the use of instruments, but may properly be construed to mean the treatment in any manner of one who is ill, as, for instance, a Christian Science healer or practitioner, for a fee. Consequently, I hold that Christian Scientists undertaking the cure of the sick without having first secured a license to practise medicine become subject to the penalties of the law. This in no way interferes with the religious belief of anybody.

One may employ what plumber he pleases, but the plumber must be duly qualified, or it is an offence for him to perform the work. Many other like instances might be cited, but it is believed that these are enough to show that it is the policy of the law not to restrict the right to employ whom one pleases, but for the public good and health it requires that the one permitting himself to be employed must be possessed of certain qualifications. The enacting of such laws is clearly within the police powers of the State, and it is strictly within the doctrine laid down in the so-called Mormon case in the Supreme Court of the United States, where it is held that with man's relation to his Maker and the obligations he may think they impose, and the manner in which an expression shall be made by him of his belief, no interference can be permitted, provided always the laws of society, designed to secure its health, peace, and prosperity, are not interfered with. However free the exercise of religion may be, it must be subordinate to the laws of the land."

Since Judge Neelen delivered this opinion, it has been overruled by Judge Elliot of the circuit court. Unfortunately for the public health, the law in this instance does not allow the State to appeal to the court of last resort. The judge who overruled this decision decided that "prayer was not medicine," which is patent to all, but he ignored the fact that the two healers before him had treated a helpless child afflicted with a deadly contagious disease, had accepted money for their treatment, and had held themselves out as healers of disease. Judge Elliot's decision, unless overruled, necessitates another struggle in the State of Wisconsin against empiricism and dangerous practices under the guise of religion.

The Supreme Court of Nebraska, in a Christian Science case, said:

"Under the indictment, the sole question presented upon the evidence was whether or not the defendant within the time charged had operated on, or professed to heal or prescribe for, or otherwise treat, any physical or mental ailment of another.

There was involved no question of sentiment nor of religious practice or duty. If the defendant was guilty as charged, neither pretence of worship nor of the performance of any other duty should have exonerated him from the punishment which an infraction of the statute involved."

It will thus be seen that, while some few courts have declared that the practice of Christian Science is not the practice of medicine, no court has ever held that to prohibit such practice by positive law is an invasion of religious liberty.

Several years ago an attempt was made in New York State to obtain a definition of the practice of medicine along the lines of the definition proposed in the last Assembly. It was effectually shelved in the legislature because a senator said that it would drive out of business a bone-setter who, he thought, had saved his life. The effort made before the present legislature developed an equally remarkable opposition. A retired lawyer, who was formerly one of the great leaders of the New York bar, de-

clared himself unalterably opposed to the proposed definition because, if it became a law, it would prevent him from prescribing remedies to a lady who often visited his house. But perhaps the most effective reason for the opposition was that the votes of the irregular practitioners and their friends would be used to defeat any legislator who voted for the definition. These objections, while only a few of those actually advanced, are sufficient to bring out strongly the necessity for educating the public to a realization of the principle involved in the medical practice acts. When this is thoroughly understood, a general demand that no legislature can resist will go up from the people for the enactment of the desired law.

Nor should other professional men leave the physician alone in his work of agitation and education. It was an encouraging sign when fifty lawyers of reputation at the New York City bar voluntarily presented a printed memorial to the last New York Assembly, endorsing the proposed bill to define the practice of medicine. Who knows when some sect may claim that the writing of wills and the pleading of causes is a "religious belief"? The same Assembly that refused to define the practice of medicine was eager to admit to the practice of law by special acts a number of laymen who were unable or unwilling to stand the regular bar examination. It was only when Governor Odell emphatically vetoed such vicious legislation that the State was spared this humiliating step in a most dangerous direction.

With the professions of law and medicine made subjects of patronage by legislatures, all standards of professional education are endangered. Instead of these standards being raised year by year, as the best men in all professions desire, the time may come when all barriers will be swept away. The learned professions will then become a field for the unlearned and vicious, and the health and property of the citizens will become a source of plunder to the quack and the pettifogger.

CHAMPE S. ANDREWS.

THE SHORTENED COLLEGE COURSE: GRADUATE OPINION.

WE have been discussing the three years' college course in the light of general principles. The discussion has been more or less enlightening. The reasoning has been *a priori*, and *a priori* reasoning upon many educational subjects is sound, though subject to severe limitations. But already the community includes scores and even hundreds of men, in most cases educated at Harvard, who received their degree after three years of study. These men are engaged in all callings, commercial and professional. Many of them took their degree not less than ten years ago. They represent a body which is able to furnish significant testimony touching the advantage or disadvantage of the shortened college course. From many of these gentlemen I have lately received statements containing their judgment of the wisdom of completing a college course in three years. These statements represent a new method of finding out the truth about this rather serious business of the length of a college course.

It is first to be said that all these gentlemen believe that the value of a college education should not be impaired. Whether the time be three years or four, two years or five, the worth of the education should not be lessened. The A.B. degree should not be in any way cheapened. The first degree taken at Yale or Harvard after three years of work should be as significant as the same degree taken after four years. The ideal of education, whether that ideal be scholarship or training or culture, should not be lowered. Through this assurance aid is given in removing one of the perils of the general introduction of the three years' course; for, colleges that receive students into their freshman classes with a training and knowledge less by a year than the requirements of other colleges, would be obliged, in case a degree were given in three years, to cheapen that degree. This result could not fail to cause a distinct deterioration of the worth of a college education. The graduates under such a condition would, as a body, be less mature in thought, less able in reasoning, less cultured in manner, less symmetrical in development, less reverential in spirit, and less noble in character. Such a result American life could ill afford. Not for a moment can the college consider any method which

may result in diminishing its contribution to human betterment. Therefore, at once be it said that, whatever be the length of the college course, the present value of the college education must be maintained.

A fundamental principle concerning the length of the college course is this: *it should be made to depend on the student himself.* To this judgment most graduates assent. For certain men three years are enough; for other men four years are none too many.

The men who should complete their course in the shorter period are of three classes. (1) Those who use a college education as a means of fitting themselves for professional study and practice should be content with the shorter time. In particular, those students who purpose to become physicians should complete their college work in three years. To the student who is to become a physician the question of time is a serious consideration. Not only has the medical school lengthened its course from two years to three and from three years to four, but post-graduate studies and training demand an additional period of four years. The deans of our best medical schools are now advising their students to spend eight years in professional study. To the four-years spent in the medical school should be added one or two years in a hospital and also two or three years of residence abroad. Such a prolonged curriculum demands that time be saved at whatever point it may be possible.

(2) The need of economy in time is not confined to the medical school, although it is there most highly accentuated. A consideration of quite a different character applies to other professions than the medical. The student who goes to college in order to secure training for professional purposes not infrequently finds that in three years he has received all the training of which he is naturally capable. Further training would prove to be over-training. Over-training is a training in which no proper response is found in the man himself to the stimulus given from without. The stimulus to think is applied to the mind over-trained; but the mind does not think as a result of the stimulus. An influence which would usually quicken the mind now proves powerless. The mind has become stale. It has lost interest. It has no spring, no buoyancy. Its mood of eagerness and enthusiasm is supplanted by a mood of indifference and sluggishness. Several of my correspondents write of this lamentable condition as actually existing in their own cases, and as one which would have been much aggravated by a fourth year at college.

(3) There are also certain types of men who are more benefited by the briefer period of collegiate residence. One type is represented by

the indolent man. Most college men are not, despite the too common contrary opinion, to be charged with laziness. But, of course, there are college men who are lazy, and, of course too, they are more numerous than they ought to be. The best method of dealing with such men consists in simply obliging them to work hard — to work ten hours a day for six days a week and for more than four weeks of every month. For men of this type the shorter course is undoubtedly the better. It must be remembered, too, that a man may even be indolent for three years and still graduate at their close. A physician writes me: "I entered college from Phillips Academy, Andover, and went through largely on my fitting school training, developing such lazy habits that another year could not have changed me for the better." Certainly for a man of this type three years are ample.

The man, too, who is inclined to be scatter-brained and desultory in habits of thought and study finds a gain in the shorter period. Concentration of intellectual power represents, of course, one of the most precious results of a college course; and this concentration is fostered by the three years' period. One of the chief advantages of the examination system, for instance, is the necessity of applying all of one's powers to a definite duty for a specific time — an advantage which is specially precious for the man of loose intellectual habits. It may also be said in passing that the man of small purse or of many years has special inducements for taking the shorter period.

X The three years' course, however, is subject to serious objections. The abbreviated time removes many, though not all, of the opportunities for general reading, for large investigations of large subjects, and for availing oneself of many of the avocations or side-interests of college life. The student is obliged to keep his forehead close down to the college grindstone, and the grindstone is turned rapidly. One of my correspondents, a merchant of New York, says:

"The necessary rush entailed in thus crowding the requisite number of courses into three-quarters of the time prescribed for four years by tradition and experience affects thoroughness and a proper absorption. This haste also tends to demolish class feeling and social intercourse, factors of great consideration both during and after college days. In consequence, it is impossible that the education of the three-year man can be nearly as complete and finished as that of the four-year man. My case covers that class of men who are not absolutely dependent on themselves to earn a living immediately after graduation."

Another correspondent, a Boston lawyer of power and of first-rate associations, writes:

"Taking so large a number of courses in the regular way ties a man down pretty

tightly to routine college work, and prevents his doing outside work along such lines as his fancy dictates, for the pleasure there is in it, as well as cutting him off from a great deal of social life or athletic activity. In other words, it has a distinct tendency to narrow his sphere of college activity, and cuts down the line of his development to one direction, namely, class-room work. The year that is lost in the three-year course is the fourth year, which is generally the most valuable."

These writers express a truth which every college man knows, namely, that work done under pressure and with intensity is liable to be done in a narrow spirit and with narrowness of intellectual result, although these disadvantages are accompanied by certain advantages.

The longer period, too, is of peculiar value to those men who are slow of development. Such men are more numerous than is usually supposed. They do not find themselves, they do not come to themselves, until the last half of the college course. To them the freshman year is the continuation of the senior year of the fitting school. The sophomore year shows some signs of development. The junior year gives evidence of increasing power. But it is only in the last year that these men really prove the worth of the stuff which is in them. Every college officer knows of scores of such sluggish men. It would be a misfortune, some would say it would be a shame or a sin, to deprive these slow-growing plants of a fitting opportunity for development. In most colleges, the last half of the course is, for these slow-moving men, the period of blossoming and of fruitage. Any cutting off from the length of the college course would mean to them the cutting off of that part which is the more valuable.

For the men, too, who go into business a distinct disadvantage lies in the shorter period. The merchant or manufacturer has small opportunities for living what may be called the life of the spirit. He knows better than most college officers can know that the idols of the market contend against the idols of the library: Therefore, it is well, and more than well, for him to put himself while at college into as close relationship as possible with those gods to which he will find it hard in his business life to pay proper devotion. He must make his peace with them in advance; for his absences from their temple will be numerous and prolonged.

I am also sure that for certain men of rare power and endowed with ample means no training can be too long or too rich. I have in mind those men who are to become the leaders of humanity. They represent those radiant souls to whom the race is to look as wrecked sailors look at the stars. Freed from the necessity of earning a living, and blessed with rich personal endowment as well as with many objective advantages,

556 THE SHORTENED COLLEGE COURSE: GRADUATE OPINION.

they are trustees of the highest interests of humanity. If they become physicians, they embody in themselves the right and duty of research. If they become lawyers, they are students of the science and history of law, and not practitioners of its art. If they choose a life of leisure, they use leisure as an opportunity for doing noblest things for the community — things which possibly no one else would do, and which the community as at present organized can hardly do for itself. They are trustees for the race, genuine shepherds of the people. For these men should be provided the richest cultivation during a prolonged period.

Therefore, the sum of this study of the shortened college course, based primarily upon the declarations of men who have taken it, is that the length of the course may be properly made to depend on the man himself. Of course, he is to be so wise that he can properly judge this important question. In case he himself lacks this proper wisdom, he is yet to have wisdom sufficient to secure a wise judgment from others. The conclusion is that the elective principle should be applied to the time a man spends in college as well as to the studies which he pursues. This is the conclusion which, in a recent number of the "Harvard Crimson," Mr. Charles Eliot Norton states as his judgment. He says:

"It has long seemed to me desirable that a free choice should be given to the undergraduates whether to obtain the degree of A. B. by a three or a four years' course of study. A capable and industrious student can accomplish, without serious difficulty, in three years the required number of courses for a degree, and for various and sufficient reasons many students desire to do so. For a great proportion of the undergraduates three years are now, under the actual conditions of life, as long a period as can be profitably spent by them in the undergraduate department, while the graduate school affords opportunity for all who desire (whether with or without regard to a professional career), to pursue liberal studies for a longer time."

It would be well, indeed, for some men to spend five years in college; for in five years they would secure a result no richer than others may secure in three. The man, too, who can get as much in three years as another can in five should not always be content with his three; for the difficulty is not that he is getting enough, but that the five-year man is getting too little. Each man in college, therefore, should elect that the length of his course shall be such as will give the best results not only in relation to the college, but also in relation to his whole life and career. There is no magic about a four-years' course. A four-years' course does not belong to the laws of nature or to the categories of the human understanding. The principle of individuality should be made to apply to this phase of education as to every other phase of education and of life.

CHARLES F. THWING.

THE CORRUPTING POWER OF PUBLIC PATRONAGE.

FROM the commencement of our government, the question of the appointment and removal of civil employees has harassed and annoyed those charged by the people with the administration of public affairs, and at times has greatly embarrassed and seriously menaced the successful determination and execution of great governmental policies and public undertakings. The makers of the Constitution realized the danger that must threaten a republican government, should the subordinate offices become the spoils of partisan victory ; and after many days' debate as to whether the power of appointment should be vested in the two Houses of Congress, or solely with the Executive, or with the Executive and the Senate jointly, they finally determined on the latter course. They provided certain other limitations on the power of appointments to office, such as :

"No senator or representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States, which shall have been created, or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased, during such time ; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office."

These limitations were wise, but not far-reaching enough to guard against the dangerous abuse of the power of patronage.

In spite of occasional charges of such abuse, the small number of removals made during the first six administrations is evidence that no serious abuses were permitted during the first forty years of the government's existence. Early in the eighteenth century Aaron Burr, who then dominated the politics of the State of New York, introduced the spoils system in that State ; and when his pupil and follower, Mr. Van Buren, became Secretary of State, in the Jackson Administration, he inaugurated for the first time the policy that to the victors belong the spoils of office. This system, in spite of various efforts at reform, dominated our civil service until the Trumbull resolutions were passed on March 3, 1871; but it was not until the Pendleton Bill became a law, in January, 1883, that the abuses inaugurated fifty years before were seriously checked and partially reformed.

I do not expect to drift into a statement of the serious influence of the

spoils system on the government, but a few instances may not be out of place. In 1825, before the inauguration of the spoils system, the civil expenditures amounted to \$11,490,000; in 1833, after its inauguration, they reached a total of \$22,713,000, with a corresponding increase of the number of officers dependent on the government. In the succeeding years three collectors of the port of New York defaulted in amounts aggregating over \$2,000,000, and down to the appointment of Mr. Arthur, in 1871, the New York Custom House was a seething mass of corruption and abuse of power.

Although the abuses that once existed have been checked by the present Civil Service Commission, there are still many flagrant violations of the law taking place every day. So long as it is left optional with the several heads of departments to select from three names certified to them from the Civil Service Commission, or to reject the entire list without giving a trial to the men thus certified, there is bound to be more or less partisan politics shown in the selections. The result is that a new Administration succeeding one of the opposite party will surely find the great majority of the civil service positions in the hands of its political opponents; and a cry will be raised by its own partisans for an equal distribution of the places, which of necessity will destroy any civil service system ever created.

I did not, however, commence this article with the intention of discussing the evils or shortcomings of our present system, but rather to call attention to the dangerous influence exerted by the spoils system on the legislation of the country. You sometimes hear some blatant reviler of the characters of other men, who has never had an opportunity of gaining correct information, denounce senators and representatives in Congress as guilty of corruption and other high crimes and misdemeanors. I do not contend that corrupt men do not sometimes enter Congress, just as occasionally you find corrupt men in the churches, or in the professions, or among business men; but I do say, after six years' service in the House of Representatives, that I have never heard of any member of Congress being corrupted by the use of money. Taking the 357 representatives as a whole, I am sure that their moral character will not suffer in a comparison with that of the same number of citizens chosen as you come to them from any religious denomination in the land. This of necessity is so. The American people are an honest, God-fearing constituency; and, as a rule, the men they send to represent them reflect their moral character as well as their views on great political questions.

Wherein, then, is the complaint? It is that the pressure brought by the people at home on their representatives to secure offices for them gives the executive branch of the government a dangerous power in influencing legislation.

A new Administration is returned to power. Mr. Blank belongs to the same party as the President-elect. He probably comes to Washington with campaign pledges to honor; or, if he has been wise and made no ante-election promises, he has many true and tried friends and political followers who are justly entitled to his support, and for whom he desires to obtain some of the appointive offices. The new Administration has a policy it desires to carry out, which requires legislation, and bills are, therefore, introduced by the party leader. Mr. Blank finds that some of these measures are not to the interest of his constituency; or, as a man of independent thought, he conscientiously believes they will not be beneficial to the country. He calls on the Cabinet officers to secure his friend's appointment. He is met with pleasant words, and is told that his friend seems to be well endorsed, but that the matter cannot be determined at present.

Mr. Blank is then asked what he thinks in regard to the Administration measures. The member of the Cabinet is greatly astonished that he cannot support the Administration, and asks him to read somebody's report, and consider it from the standpoint of a party man, etc. After he has made his fourth or fifth call, with the same result, he will begin to hear from his friend, who tells him that congressmen from adjacent districts have received appointments, and that the people at home cannot understand why he cannot do something for his district. The question that he has now to decide is whether he shall submit to become a tool in the hands of the Administration, secure the offices, and drift with the party tides, or whether he shall be a representative of the people, determining for himself what best conserves their interest and meets the demands of justice and right. To do this he must return to face angry friends, and must meet the opposition of an unfriendly Administration. Within the last four years I have seen at least two men of great ability retire from public life rather than surrender their own individuality; being unwilling to remain and contend against a hostile Administration. When the Porto Rican bill was first reported to the House, over thirty members of the Administration party declared themselves against it; but as the debate progressed it was understood by all that the Administration whip was being brought into use to bring the recalcitrants into line. One of the original opponents had the courage to announce

openly that he had changed his views because the President had requested him to do so. And, on the final vote, only eight had the courage to support their original conviction.

I do not wish to be understood, from what I have said above, as contending that the present Administration alone is responsible for this state of affairs. It has existed with all parties and all administrations almost since the beginning of the government. All that I contend is that from decade to decade it has grown worse instead of better.

If the Democratic party has stood for one thing more than another, it has been for a policy of opposition to a permanent increase of the standing army; yet I have seen the solid phalanx of the opposition in the House of Representatives broken, in the passage of an army bill, by the distribution of patronage. When the cry for place is heard from the editor's son, the banker's son, the lawyer's son, the farmer's son — in truth, everybody's son — the guardian of the liberties of the people, the keeper of the public treasury, must, indeed, be a bold man. The bill providing for the holding of an International Exposition at St. Louis and that creating a Spanish War Claims Commission were passed, after being at first defeated, by making the Commission non-partisan, so that the advocates of the bills secured a number of candidates for the places from almost every State, to work on their home delegations. The fact that a member of Congress is regarded as the means through which patronage is distributed has so affected legislation as to cause the unnecessary expenditure of millions of dollars and the passage of bills that otherwise would never have become law.

The framers of the Constitution contemplated that the legislative branch of the government should be separate and distinct from the executive, in order that one might be a check upon the other. This was a wise provision; and, if our government is to last, it must be guarded with the utmost care. It can only be done by prohibiting by law the representative of the people from having any voice in the appointment of the governmental offices, either directly or indirectly, and making him ineligible for an appointive office under the government for at least two years after the term for which he has been elected has expired. Make his sole business that of legislation, let all fear of punishment or hope of reward come only from his constituency, and the majesty of the people as the rulers of this country will be maintained.

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD.

HIGHER TECHNICAL TRAINING.

THOSE who compare the industrial development of Europe and America and the educational advances made to influence this development cannot fail to discover our shortcomings in the one as well as in the other. There can be no doubt as to the readiness of our manufacturers to introduce improved methods and the willingness of our working people to adapt themselves to them. On the other hand, European countries possess the advantage of inherent skill in their working classes, transmitted by inheritance, so to speak, in industries rooted for generations in the same locality. What seems of greatest importance, however, is the endeavor of European governments to augment by educational establishments the effectiveness of this adaptability. Technical and industrial art schools are considered the best means of furthering this end; and they have been introduced to the great advantage of the industries of European countries. Our own shortcomings in regard to manufactures are so apparent that efforts toward higher technical training may be looked upon as a national necessity.

This, in brief, was the substance of my findings as embodied in a report made to Mr. Bayard, then Secretary of State, after a visit to Germany for the purpose of investigating the differences in technical and industrial fields as between America and European countries.¹ In the spring following, a special commission was extended to me for the study of the condition and progress of technical education and the status of the economy of production, in Europe.

A report on "Industrial Education in France," published by the State Department in 1888, gave a description of the educational system of France. That country was selected for a basis, because a system of public instruction, applying new principles, had been created there, with the express aim of equipping the workers with all the facilities which the experience of ages had contributed to the arts and manufactures. The kindergarten, the primary and secondary schools, the high schools, and the colleges all aim at making the eye the instrument by which the

¹ See Consular Reports, No. 72, December, 1886.

mind is trained. Drawing and manual training form an essential part of the curriculum through all the grades. Special trade schools are established for the various lines of industries not only in Paris, but in other towns where their want is felt.

The inquiry, however, was planned on a much broader basis. The first part was to be followed by reports on technical education in Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and Great Britain. Another report for which material had been collected was to deal with the methods employed in production in different countries. "It will be readily understood," it was stated, "that the inquiry must be extended over the same field in the United States. A general review will then enable us to perceive whatever may be of advantage for us to adopt."¹

A change in the administration prevented the execution of the work as outlined. The first part was the only part issued. Secretary Bayard, in a letter dated December 14, 1888, asked Congress for an appropriation of \$10,000, to make the completion of the work possible. He stated:

"The work in question consists of facts, not opinions, and the object has been to supply authentic and valuable information for the instruction and benefit of the people of the United States, and especially those engaged in, or contemplating, manufacturing industries. The volume already published will enable an intelligent estimate to be formed of the method under which the information has been procured, the facts deducible, and the general utility and value of the work."

The matter fell through, however, on account of the opposition of the protectionists. The most biased interpretation was given to this work, which had been undertaken by the State Department for the information of all persons engaged in our industries or interested in their development.

What was the reason of this inimical attitude? Why this strenuous opposition to the diffusion of information on the vexed and complicated industrial and economic problems that were confronting us? Was the pillar of protectionism threatened by the statement, confirmed from time to time by the evidence of special reports, that our superior working capacity and our quicker adoption and fuller utilization of improved machinery enabled us to produce as cheaply as, and in many instances more cheaply than, European countries, with their lower rate of wages and lower standard of living? This investigation made havoc with that bulwark of protectionism, the pauper labor theory. The grounds on which a system of onerous taxation was permitted to stand were shown to be fictitious. Enlightenment, naturally, was considered dangerous by

¹ See Report on Technical Education in Europe. Department of State, 1888.

the beneficiaries of the system. The illusion had to be maintained at all costs, notwithstanding the story told by the steamers loaded down to the keel with the products of our highly paid labor.

But what of the schools and institutes of learning created all over the industrial districts of Europe in aid of their industries? Were they not worth studying? Was it not worth while to learn of the means employed by governments to assist in the struggle for superiority in the industrial field or for the maintenance of positions already gained? The world was awake to the importance of this subject. Was the knowledge of the practice of foreign countries to be included in the list of excluded imports? England had appointed commissions, and other governments had followed suit. Even Russia had made steps in advance in some directions.

Distant Japan, but yesterday awakened from her mediæval sleep, had sent out commissioners to learn how best to adopt or improve the methods employed by Western nations in making learning the handmaid of industry. Her wonderful school exhibit in 1889, at the Paris exposition, revealed to the world what might be expected in the future from the island empire of the Pacific. It attracted the attention of visitors of all classes, from the rural districts no less than from the towns. Here was a nation showing by her exhibit that her workers were unequalled in skill and taste by the most advanced nations of Europe. The blend and richness of its colors, the softness in the texture of its silks, whether in weighty fabrics or in the lighter tissues, its cloisonné vases of exquisite beauty, such as we never see exhibited to the public gaze in our shops or museums, and its metal work and ivory carvings, attracted well-merited admiration. A thousand years of hereditary adaptation have given the Japanese workman such a dexterity of hand and such an eye for color and æsthetic properties that, with the simplest tools, often of his own manufacture, he produces those inimitable objects of skill which force us to acclaim him our past master in the industrial arts. Had Japan elected to rest with self-complacency where she stood twenty-five years ago, she would at least have been able to put forward, in vindication of her position, achievements of the kind here briefly touched upon.

But she has selected the opposite course. Her high schools of learning, her universities, and her technical schools have been established on the most advanced plains. The programmes sent to the exposition included all branches of study. The examination papers showed how the rising generation of Japan had grappled with the new conditions. The students of the University of Tokio contributed papers on chemistry

and mechanics written in French and in English. One paper, written in German, treated of the history of the Hohenstaufen; another, written in English, dealt with an episode of English history; and a third described in French the crusades of St. Louis. Among other exhibits were physical and chemical apparatus made by the pupils of the higher technical schools. It is considered of great importance in a country situated as Japan is, that the scientist who is called upon to labor in localities where the necessary instruments are wanting or deficient should be capable of extricating himself by self-help out of his difficulty. Still, with all this equipment denoting mental capacity of the highest order, Japan is alert in her search for information wherever there is room for improvement. To let well alone is to abdicate one's position.

There was a time when industry was ahead of the schools. The Industrial Museum of Lyons shows a collection of silk tissues covering every period from the introduction of the industry into Europe down to the present day. The earliest specimens are Byzantine from the fourth or fifth century of our era. We can read the industrial history of the centuries by looking at the objects in glass cases. We see how culture proceeded from the Orient to the Occident. Egypt, Moresque Spain and Sicily, Venice, Lombardy, Burgundy, Flanders, France—all these in their turn handed down the sceptre of commerce and of power, wrapped in the products of industrial arts, in the line of succession as intimated here. But it was the view of the curator of the museum, who had spent his life and his private fortune in the collection of these treasures, that the beauty and perfection of the work and its richness of color had retrograded with the progress of time. A far less cultivated eye had received the same impression.

The workman of ancient and mediæval times mastered his art in all its details. His work was part of himself. Where to-day a dozen different trades combine in the production of a piece of tissue, then one hand manipulated all or nearly all the operations from the plain thread to the finished product. When a progressive step in mechanical devices or in chemical invention could be made only at the risk of the inventor's neck, the preservation of methods was a necessary result. Machine employment could not develop under the hangman's threat. The principle that ruled industry was the very opposite of that which rules it to-day. Intensity speaks out of every fibre in the fabrics of the past as well as out of every detail of the smith's work in gold, silver, or iron, while the paling effect of extensiveness in the products of the present time cannot be concealed by the most ingenious artifices.

From this point of view nothing can ever take the place of the hand worker. The machine-driven loom can never give the suppleness to the fabric that distinguishes a *crêpe-de-chine*, nor could all the arts of Europe and America combined produce a square yard of work equal to the exquisite beauty, in color, design, and clinging softness, seen in an India shawl. Not all our learning could enable an adept of one of our most celebrated schools or workshops to turn out a carpet or a rug such as is produced in Daghestan or Persia. Yet all this is the work of uneducated peasants, who might possibly be discomfited if they were examined in the three R's.

This work stands in about the same relation to the best that our factories turn out as that in which the Madonna di San Sisto stands toward the Madonnas of present-day painters or of the copyists who would reproduce the cinque-cento picture. The contours are there, but the depth and warmth of feeling are wanting that give expression to a masterpiece of religious art. All our training has not been able to create a Jamnitzer or Cellini in the goldsmith's art. An age without imagination cannot supply more than what is acquired by the plodding, mechanical minds of our present art-workers.

In the manufacturing industries work has become decentralized, and has lost its connecting link. The industrial worker coöperating in the production of an article has not the slightest interest in the ultimate use of that part on which he is engaged. The principle of the division of labor is carried to the minutest detail. Every step in the industrial progression is marked by the application of specially devised machinery. An immense output is the only object of this constantly grinding mechanism. Now, where the efficiency of the individual working hand is measured by the number of spindles, looms, or tool machines he is able to manage, or the number of yards, pieces, or pounds he is able to turn out in a given period, the perfection of the work is dependent more on that of the system than on that of the individual engaged in any special manipulation.

The creation of schools becomes essential under this new dispensation in the same proportion as the worker loses his connection with the work, and becomes practically a part of the mechanism he supervises. Instead of being a worker he is now a tender, an attendant. In the textiles he has become a splicer of threads; in the mechanics an oiler of journals and gearings, or an adjuster of materials and beltings. Even when a finished product is finally to emerge from this babel of parts, the idea is removed from the worker to the office. But whoever is re-

sponsible for it, the flaws in the material, in the thread, or in the coloring cannot in the slightest degree be concealed when the article goes into the market to seek a purchaser.

Americans have always shown great expertness in the manufacture of wearing apparel for men and women. White cotton underwear for women, though richly trimmed with lace and embroidery, which pays a fine of sixty per cent at the custom-house for the crime of being of foreign origin, has found markets in Canada and England. Of late years the manufacture of shirt-waists for women has grown to immense proportions. An attempt to open connections in England proved for a time eminently successful. The tastefulness of the articles produced was recognized on all sides, and large orders were obtained. But after one successful season the business collapsed. This was mainly due to the inferiority of the materials used. The uneven threads produced an uneven fabric, and the dyes and color blends could not satisfy the eyes that were accustomed to the exquisite work produced in ginghams in Scotland and the finer prints of Mülhausen and Manchester. But to pay forty, fifty, or sixty per cent duty on these, to manufacture them here, and to re-export them to England, where in the meantime people had learned a thing or two from our own methods, was of course, out of the question. No other cause than that of inferiority of fabrics can possibly be adduced for the stagnant and even retrogressive figures of our exports of cotton goods to countries which are our very next-door neighbors. To examine the products of English, German, and French looms is to comprehend this fact in all its bearings. It is the constant endeavor of the governments of those countries to enable their industries to supply under the new development all that was formerly given to the fabrics by workers of special fitness and application.

It would be an error to suppose that all manufacturing industries are now subject to the régime of division of labor. Many of them cannot be conducted on this plan, and a great deal of work has therefore to follow the ancient course; the hand of the worker being assisted, however, by more or less improved mechanical appliances. But in all cases the idea to be embodied is that of shape or ornament, which has to be rendered by color or design. The artistic idea can no more be dissociated from a piece of printed calico than from a vase or from the portico of a temple.

When England discovered in 1851, at her first world exhibition, that the condition of her artistic development was liable to endanger her trading eminence, she did not hesitate long in determining on the proper

remedy. She adopted the only possible means of raising the industrial standard, namely, the creation of art schools and museums. In spite of all the efforts subsequently made by other nations in that direction the South Kensington Institute is still unrivalled to-day. It is unnecessary to speak of the vast resources of its museum, which is known the world over as a treasure-house of ancient, mediæval, and modern art. Weeks of study can be profitably spent in its extensive galleries. Any one who desires ideas and models from which to work out designs for his trade or art can find ready for his service the noblest objects which the world has ever produced and time has not destroyed. The institute has all over the world agents who are instructed to buy up specimens worthy to adorn its halls. Its operations do not end here. Every English town that aspires to the distinction of having an art museum or that is already in possession of one can be supplied with circulating loan exhibits, which remain for a certain period, after which they are exchanged for other objects, under the advice of the master of the art school usually connected with the museum. In this manner an interest is kept up in the art museums of these provincial manufacturing towns. But many of these have museums of their own of a character that would quite astonish those who lavish terms of admiration upon collections like those of the New York Metropolitan Museum, the Boston Museum of Art, or the Philadelphia collection of objects of industrial art. The Birmingham Museum is especially rich in specimens of industrial skill of rare beauty, more or less related to the industries of the town. These museums are generally the depositories of rich private collections, originally placed there as loan exhibits, but in most cases ultimately becoming bequests.

The most important museums of Germany are usually the collections of princely or royal houses, supplemented for generations by their art-loving scions. The National Museum at Munich and the Germanic Museum at Nuremberg could hardly be excelled for the historical interest of their collections in industrial art. Possessing a wealth of precious and beautiful objects, they lack, however, the variety and comprehensiveness of the British collections. Special efforts are being made to establish museums in industrial centres, where, of course, prominence is given to the articles chiefly manufactured in the district.

Art teaching in the United Kingdom is rooted in the general system emanating from South Kensington. This is held by many to smack too much of a cut-and-dried system. I did not find, however, that an able head-master lacked sufficient freedom, within a certain general line of

rules, to develop incipient talent to very good fruition. The specialization of teaching to serve the industrial centre where the schools are located would in itself be a powerful help toward a somewhat free exercise of individuality.

The liberal distribution of these schools to suit the purposes of manufacturing industries is illustrated by the fact that North Staffordshire has an art school in each of the five towns that form the Pottery district. These towns now extend so far that it is difficult to say where one begins or the other ends, and all are connected by tram-cars and steam. The great benefit which local industries receive from this widely extended art teaching, supported by a wealth of objects of art, selected for their beauty, is clearly shown in this case. Minton, Doulton, Wedgwood, and Royal Worcester wares are known the world over. If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, they cannot complain of lack of appreciation. They are copied extensively by German manufacturers, who, as is usual with imitators, leave out of the design the more expensive work, producing a very similar article at a considerably lower figure. The English do not seem to relish this kind of martyrdom. Yet it cannot be dissociated from the palm of originality.

Perhaps no single object has given to art industry higher inspiration and better commercial results than that unapproached gem in ground glass work, the Portland Vase. Whoever understands the technical difficulties in grinding a group of figures out of two adhering glass layers of a disc will understand the magnitude of the undertaking when the same operation has to be performed on a heavy round object like a vase. Yet the master hand that wrought the design accomplished it without a flaw. As the years roll on, countless imitations of this work are produced in clay and glass, from the cameo plaque and the paste-on-paste down to the Wedgwood and their imitators' processes in laid-on ornament from moulds. I was shown by the director of the Royal Worcester works a Japanese vase in cloisonné, not more than nine or ten inches high, for which he had paid 160 guineas. One could see in its exquisite lines of ornamentation the origin of the highly prized pieces of this world-renowned factory. To these directors no price is too high for a truly valuable piece on which to feed the imagination of their designers. Indeed, without this support of the object world in art, art teaching would remain dry and barren.

Art teaching in France is known to be of a very high order, and is conducted systematically. Perhaps one of the best features of the system is the annual reunion of art teachers in Paris. Provincial art teachers

have their expenses paid by the government if they wish to attend these assemblies. A main object associated with these reunions is the opportunity they give for visiting the galleries and art exhibitions of Paris.

Technical education is a very comprehensive term. It includes in its range all branches of instruction calculated to further the productive processes. Forced by the exigencies of the situation, we have advanced, within the life of this generation, to the head of the nations in engineering work and in machine construction. The high rate of wages ruling in this country, a condition beyond cavil and debate, made the application of labor-saving machinery a self-evident necessity. The inventor had a profitable field for the employment of all his latent ingenuity, the inheritance of a race just emerged from the task of subduing a continent. With our achievements in hand as proof of our mastery it would be futile to spend words on this branch of the field of technical education. Quantitatively, production has nowhere else received the impetus it is receiving in the United States. In this survey special reference need, therefore, be made only to the advantages extended by schools to industries wherein skill and taste will always remain the determining features and the creators of values.

L'école d'horlogerie, of Geneva, supplies the best model for the school of a district whose industry has to grapple alike with the new and with the old system of work. While instruction is given in such a thorough manner that the pupil is trained to make by hand all the parts of a watch or chronometer from the crude materials, he is at the same time instructed in all the details of the complicated machinery employed in watch-making. Machine construction, so far as watch-making is concerned, is a special part of the school plan. An interesting school worthy of equal study by our manufacturing art-industries is the *École des arts industriels* at Geneva. Design and practical execution in bronze, clay, marble, and decorative ironwork speak of effective teaching. The productions are of a high character, and always find ready purchasers. There are few prominent centres devoted to art industries in Germany that are not supported by more or less well-equipped schools. In the metallic branches, however, I could not find any as thoroughly organized for the putting of theory into working practice as the two here mentioned, excepting perhaps the *Königliche Industrieschule* at Munich, where practical training is carried to a high degree.

Close attention is paid in Germany to technical education in the textile industries. In fabrics color is, next to design, the breath-giving force. Chemistry has wrested the sceptre from nature's hand. The colors which

are not creations of the laboratory are few indeed. Germany has for years held undisputed mastery in the color industries. Her universities teach the science of their production without special regard to their application. This assures at all times a succession of capable teachers and experts, devoted to original research. The polytechnic schools instruct in the sciences as applied to industry. They vie with the universities to attract to themselves the best professorial talent. The director of the *Eidgenössische Polytechnicum* at Zurich complained to me that he had but recently lost two of his best professors because, owing to the poverty of Switzerland, his school could not possibly pay the salaries offered in Germany for high chemical talent. One of these professors had accepted a call to Göttingen at a salary of 30,000 marks, and another to Munich with 50,000 marks for life. The highest salary they could pay in Zurich was 10,000 francs. This may seem an extravagant statement; but when we consider the high salaries paid to expert chemists by the Ludwigshafen, Elberfeld, and other color and dye works, the matter loses its aspect of improbability. As this munificence is far beyond Germany's usual attitude toward her officials, it shows plainly what her views are with regard to the fructifying effect upon industry of a thorough training. We can easily see the result of applying this principle of the economy of high wages to these industries, absolutely the creation of the brain, by which hundreds of millions of marks are produced from the refuse heaps of coal. Germany's exports in coal-tar colors and aniline dyes amount to about 80,000,000 marks a year.

None of the color works of prominence has less than a dozen highly remunerated expert chemists in its employ, and no outlay is deemed too high to secure a new discovery. Years of investigation in the laboratory without visible results are not considered wasted in view of the general utility of research. The chief chemists receive a share in the profits in addition to their salaries. However, the annual dividends declared demonstrate the wisdom of this policy.

But this is only the higher stratum. The special schools conduct laboratory work to meet the requirements of the industries for whose support they have been founded. The best organized school is the Royal Weaving School of Crefeld, with its annex, the Dyeing and Finishing Department. This school is chiefly devoted to silk, though all other textiles receive attention in the theoretical courses. Its resources include a rich collection of textiles and a large library of books and illustrations to assist in the teaching of design. As in Lyons, the pupils are expected to collect flowers and plants for the designs they have in hand.

Attention is likewise given to machine drawing, and workshop practice in woodwork is compulsory. The pupils make the wooden patterns for the silk machinery, the castings of which are, however, made outside, and practise the mounting and taking apart of looms, etc. The object is to make them expert in the repairing and handling of every loom and working machine that may in the future come under their hands.

It is needless to say that every kind of machinery required in bringing the thread from the cocoon to its final condition in thread-dyed, piece-dyed, or printed fabrics is assigned liberal representation in the well-arranged and spacious workrooms. It is the policy of the school to possess a specimen of every loom of good repute, and every new invention is subjected to a full test, giving thereby not a little help to the Crefeld manufacturers. At the time of my visit the school owned about eighty looms of different kinds, including several examples of a Russian invention easily workable by foot-power and intended to be used against the power loom. Though sixty of them were used in a neighboring factory with satisfactory results, the director's opinion was that the loom would not make much headway, as it required very expert weavers, and because the small power motors made it possible to run power looms in the hands of weave-masters at a trifling expense. The district from Crefeld to Elberfeld and up to the small metal goods country — Iserlohn, Remscheid, Solingen — is now so fully supplied with electric power, made serviceable to the old home-industries, that we see here as a sign of the times of no small importance a decentralization of industries progressively sustaining itself against the aggressive competition of the capitalistically organized power-mill.

That the Dyeing and Finishing School is of the highest merit is attested by the great demand for its graduates at home and abroad. A thorough theoretical and practical course is given in all branches of chemistry applied to practical life. The color industries, dyeing, bleaching, stuff-printing by hand and rollers, finishing, the manufacture and character of dyes and colors, the mordants, the behavior of the different textiles toward coloring matters, the analysis of water and its purification — all these are subjects of theoretical teaching, supported by direct manipulation in the laboratories and workrooms.

I might say a few words about the textile school of Mülheim on the Rhine, which holds high rank in the opinion of manufacturers of cotton goods. Schools at Mülhausen in Elsass, at Dresden, and at Chemnitz would deserve mention as assisting the representative textile industries of these localities. But as none of them holds rank with the Crefeld

school, the subject has received sufficient treatment when the most prominent one has been brought to the attention of the American reader.

It is not to be supposed that England has not exerted herself in the establishment of similar schools, though none of them equals the Crefeld school. The Bradford Technical College and the Yorkshire College at Leeds give close attention to practical instruction in all branches of scientific training helpful to the woollen and worsted industries. The Owens College in Manchester and the Mason Science College in Birmingham have a beneficial influence upon the industries of these centres. The same may be said of Nottingham University College. Workshop practice is carried on through the courses in machine building as well as in industries more closely connected with the respective towns. While these colleges are not able to cope with the technical school mentioned above, the introduction of these trade specialties into their courses shows the effort they are making not to neglect the important point, that learning must have a practical end if it is to be of any use in the economics of the people. The examination papers at these institutions testify that every year an amount of trained talent of no mean order is being diffused among the industries of England.

Americans could pick up many suggestions of the highest value without crossing the Channel or the Rhine. The work of the "City and Guilds of London Institute for the Advancement of Technical Education" is making a valuable contribution to the spread of technical training, and is producing gratifying results. This institute occupies the same position toward trade and manufactures that South Kensington occupies toward art instruction, and the Science Department toward science schools. It sends out examiners, and conducts examinations on the results of which grants are given to teachers, and prizes and scholarships to pupils. Its diplomas of efficiency and graduation are highly valued, and always secure good appointments to their possessors. The examinations cover no less than thirty-five trades and manufacturing industries. Directly subordinated to, and forming a part of, the Institute are the Central Institution, on Exhibition Road, in the West End, and the Finsbury College, in the Eastern district. The former is a higher college, with the object of training persons to become technical teachers, or to enter industrial or professional careers. The Finsbury College aims to prepare persons of either sex for intermediate posts in industrial management and for the courses at the Central Institution.

I should not do justice to this subject did I not refer, if only in the briefest manner, to the efforts that are being made in the direction of

higher commercial education. Paris has three commercial colleges, the most important of which is the *École des hautes études commerciales*, one of the best in France, in the Boulevard Malesherbes, while that in Bordeaux deserves more than passing mention. But in this respect Germany is probably foremost among commercial nations. The commercial languages of the world, political economy and commercial law, banking and finance, the trade habits and productive facilities of various countries, are among the leading subjects of instruction. The high reputation gained by several of the commercial high schools of Germany has not been sufficient to deter the Government from endeavoring to extend their reach, as has been demonstrated of late by the creation of two commercial universities. A new departure has thus been made which has raised learning in the practical branches of everyday life to the dignity that was heretofore enjoyed by the old classical studies only. A similar striving for advancement is visible in all the departments of knowledge which minister to art and industry.

If we now ask what America has been doing, we must confess that the field is as bare in all these particulars as it was a dozen years ago. We are striving with might and main to occupy a leading position as exporters of manufactures. But if we had the goods which the world demands, how would young men of American education be qualified to sell them? Proficiency in Spanish would certainly be of the highest utility in connection with our recent acquisitions; but this language has scarcely a place in our colleges. Any one of the Latin tongues is a help to the acquisition of any of the sister languages; but how many of a thousand graduates of college and university master French enough to be able to express themselves in that language with any fluency?

Commercial schools have no room allotted to them in our educational system in spite of its vast outlay. Owing to their ignorance of the language of the country, our salesmen and buyers when sent to foreign markets are in the hands of the local commissionaires, unless they have received a foreign business education. Our manufacturers testify to the absurd inadequacy of our educational facilities by their employment of foreigners, largely English, in intermediate positions, as overseers and managers. Our silk manufacturers draw their best talent from men educated in the Crefeld school. Many of them have themselves gone through its courses, and are sending their sons to enjoy the same advantage. A few men scattered here and there can scarcely build up an industry. Unless we can distribute educated talent through all the departments in dyeing, finishing, and the intermediate processes, we may boast of the

quantities of silk annually thrown on the market, but our products will not rise above their present standard. The deficiency in color and finish, when a comparison is made with the rich hues of foreign fabrics, is too apparent to require comment.

Our tariff, by excluding foreign competition, condemns our industries to æsthetic inertia. An attempt to reach higher ideals of perfection is unnecessary where the law assures a monopoly of trade. The examples of better foreign work, by which taste is diffused and stimulated, are absent, and producer and consumer alike become satisfied with "good enough" because "better" is unknown. This makes it all the more necessary to create vehicles for the spread of knowledge in art and science, and opportunities for high technical training in industries which depend entirely on taste as their spark of life. Whatever we do must start from the standpoint of art — the æsthetic idea. Mere weaving schools would give our manufacturers good loom fixers and overseers, but would leave the actual products in the same unattractive condition.

Millions upon millions are annually expended by munificent donors on universities and colleges. The golden rain never reaches the parched ground which most needs it. We cannot well appeal to the state for so necessary an aid to our industrial development. We should be speaking to deaf ears. Our manufacturers are only beginning to understand how the industries to which they owe their fortunes would profit from the higher training of the workers. They prefer to exploit in their own mills the highly educated talent of European countries rather than to create schools at home. Those who are able to avail themselves of this advantage would rather see the utilization of this talent confined to the few than have schools at home distribute this knowledge over the whole industrial sphere.

As far as I know, the only school that has taken any steps toward bridging the gulf is the Philadelphia Textile School. I visited it in 1888, and again quite recently, and found on my second visit that considerable progress had been made during the interval. It is established on a very promising basis. Its central thought is the æsthetic idea, with which the technical branches are coördinated. But its means are limited, and the support it receives from manufacturers is *nil*.

A few millions would not be misspent in bringing to its full growth an establishment based on the proper foundations. A manifold return would be made for all the sums spent on museums, laboratories, and lecture-rooms. It goes without saying that such an institution cannot be established except in a large centre of population of metropolitan char-

acter, with its artistic and commercial influences. Within the last few years wealth has grown, without effort on the part of its accumulators, so to speak, to dimensions hitherto undreamed of. It is measured by the hundreds of millions now held in single hands. The immensity of such resources must in time become a burden to the possessors. What better method could they find to liberate themselves from the accumulating interest of these huge fortunes, than that of using it in the manner here suggested? It is noble work to give young men that higher training which will enable them to bring to a higher plane of perfection the industries to which they attach themselves, and thus make them truly independent of foreign competition.

JACOB SCHOENHOF.

THE MOVEMENT FOR A SHORTER WORKING-DAY.

THE demand for a shorter working-day, although at the present season more than usually insistent, is one of the oldest features in the programme of organized labor. For a hundred years it has inspired the thought and activity of trade-unionists in the United States. It has held a leading, if not the first, place in the formula of every labor organization that has been formed during that period; it has survived and gathered force when other plans, supposed to be more comprehensive, have failed and have passed from the field of discussion. The effort to lessen the daily hours of labor was one of the earliest fruits of the industrial system under which the "sun to sun" rule prevailed. Having its bases in the intellectual and material needs of the workers, the demand for a shorter working-day has been made with renewed vigor at every epoch in the country's history.

In the first decades of the century, when general poverty and ample opportunity coincided to compel the greatest possible effort, when thirteen and fifteen hours constituted the "normal" working-day, and when women and children were cowhided to their tasks in the factories of New England, the ten-hour movement arose. At the close of the Civil War, when, as a result of the rapid development of the country's manufacturing industries, the first great contrast between riches and poverty presented itself, thus suggesting a potent subject of protest to minds but recently agitated by the question of chattel slavery, the labor organizations again asserted their demand for a reduction of the hours of labor. The result of these efforts, although varying in particular cases, has been a material reduction in the length of the working-day in the general industries of the country. The present movement, then, inspired by developments no less radical than those which have marked preceding industrial epochs, involves but a short and easy step in the transition from the old to the new principle of the normal working-day.

The present nine-hour day movement of the International Association of Machinists is part of the well-defined policy of the organized trades of the United States. Beginning in 1884, three years after its forma-

tion, the American Federation of Labor has followed a systematic plan to reduce the hours of labor in those industries which at a given time are best prepared by organization and other conditions to make a sustained effort. In this way definite shape and effect have been given to the sentiment which was formerly expressed more or less sporadically. Under the system now pursued by the Federation, the particular trade conditions are carefully studied for a year, or, it may be, for a much longer period. The mutual interests of trades and localities are consulted, and all questions which bear directly or indirectly upon any particular case are scrupulously weighed. Funds, in some cases specific, in others general, are raised and appropriated in support of the organization chosen by the annual convention to lead the movement for the reduction of the hours of labor. By this method a number of crafts — notably the cigar-makers, carpenters, and furniture-workers — have reduced the average length of the day's work from ten hours to eight. Thus the movement has proceeded from year to year, with occasional intermissions during periods of great depression.

At the twentieth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor, held at Louisville, Kentucky, last December, the following resolution was adopted:

"That the President of the American Federation of Labor is hereby instructed to advise all general and local organizers of the American Federation of Labor to assist the International Association of Machinists wherever possible to bring about a more thorough organization of the trade, and to coöperate with and assist the International officers of the above Association to the end that the nine-hour day may be successfully inaugurated."

In accordance with the terms of this resolution, President Gompers and a number of organizers employed by the Federation, in conjunction with the officials of the Machinists, spent several weeks almost exclusively in preparation for the enforcement of the demand, which was made on May 20. In a recent public address, President O'Connell, chief executive of the Machinists, set forth the position of his craftsmen in the statement that, computing the total number of machinists in the country at 150,000, the reduction of the daily hours of labor from ten to nine would give employment to an additional 15,000 men. The effect of the reduction, declared Mr. O'Connell, would be "higher pay, more time out of the shop, and, consequently, more highly developed manhood and more cheerful homes." This statement epitomizes the whole ground upon which rests the movement for a shorter working-day. The justice of that movement, then, depends upon the validity of these claims.

The employment of additional labor as a result of the reduction of

the hours of labor, either directly to maintain the total of the product or indirectly to meet an increased demand, is a necessary assumption in the circumstances. It has been claimed that the length of the working-day may be decreased without necessarily reducing the individual product. But this contention, while probably well founded when made with reference to hand labor, is not maintained when dealing with those crafts in which machinery is extensively used, since the capacity of machinery is governed by mechanical rules. This may be considered granted by both employers and employees. The opposition to the reduction of the hours of labor rests upon the increased cost involved, which is due directly to the employment of additional labor to maintain the total of the product, or indirectly to the enforced stoppage, and consequent depreciation of tools and machinery.

It is understood, of course, that the effort to shorten the working-day presupposes the maintenance of wages at the previously existing figure. The economic issue, therefore, is a question of relatively higher wages, and, consequently, of actual increase in the cost of the product. To this question the trade-unionists reply that the additional cost of the product is more than counterbalanced by the increased demand; and that while the rate of profit may decrease the amount increases. On the other hand, the market price of a commodity, although temporarily or even permanently increased under the shorter working-day system, decreases in proportion to the increase in the consuming power.

This reasoning proceeds upon the rule that wages are regulated not by the length of the working-day, but by the standard of living. Much of the opposition to the reduction of the hours of labor is based upon the common error expressed by the sophism, "Ten hours' pay for nine hours' work." If wages were really paid by the hour, we should find, as a rule, that wages are increased as the working-day is lengthened. It is well known, however, that the opposite condition prevails; that, as between given industries and countries, the longer working-day is invariably distinguished by the lower wage rate. The facts of the movement for a shorter working-day demonstrate that wages increase not only relatively to the amount of work done, but also positively as the result of the diminished competition among the workers. This fact is the strongest possible substantiation of the contention that the wage rate is governed wholly by those considerations which we have in mind when we speak of the "standard of living." "More time out of the shop" means more time for rest and recreation; leading to the creation of new desires, and the consequent elevation, or at least diversification, of the

accustomed mode of living. By a natural process these desires become needs the satisfaction of which is as imperative to the sense of decency as is that of the purely physical wants to the maintenance of life itself.

The increased demand for the products of labor serves not only to readjust the relations between wages, cost, and profits, but also to preserve the utility of the so-called labor-saving machine. The value of any improvement in industrial methods must depend upon economizing rather than destroying labor. (Ruskin has said, in effect, that economy in money matters consists neither in saving nor in spending, but in using. So it is with the labor-saving machine.) This we can see by supposing the case of a machine which would "save" all forms of labor other than those required for its manipulation. Such a machine would be useless, for the reason that if the labor of the world were without the opportunity of application, there could be no demand for its products. In a proportionate degree, the machine-labor system that is conducted with the view of attaining the limit of production with the smallest possible outlay in labor, rather than of conserving a proper balance between the producing and the consuming powers, is necessarily wasteful and self-destructive. Ultimately, the only economy in the use of machinery lies in changing the direction of labor from lesser to larger productive ends.

Possibly there is a point at which, under the operation of "supply and demand," this tendency will correct itself. But why the necessity of continuing toward that point? It may be admitted that the labor displaced by the machine in some industries is partially absorbed in the new openings made by the machine itself. It may even be admitted that in time the machine will have so cheapened production that the increased demand thus invited will recall the amount of labor originally displaced. But in the practical point of view there exists an appreciable and ever-growing residuum of idle men and women whose future is bounded by their personal resources, and to whom, therefore, philosophy and statistics can offer but scant comfort. Practically, so far as the displaced labor of to-day is concerned, demand is a fixed quantity. The purpose of the movement for a shorter working-day is to apply an immediate corrective to the tendency toward the displacement of labor.

Already the industrial pace is telling in the increasing acuteness of the struggle for the world's markets. The bearing of that struggle upon the movement for the reduction of hours is significantly illustrated by the opposition to the National Eight-Hour Bill, which, after passing the House of Representatives of the 55th and 56th Congresses, has been held up in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, at the instance of

the government contractors in the ship-building and steel-making industries. These firms reason, quite correctly, that the enforced reduction of hours on government work in any establishment would compel a like reduction on private work. Such, indeed, is the natural and well-understood effect of all legislation on the subject. This tendency has been demonstrated in every instance since President Van Buren, in 1840, signed the first order limiting to ten hours the length of the day's work in the Washington Navy Yard and all other public establishments.

Although the effort to secure legislation limiting the length of the working-day deals primarily with public employees and with the extension of police powers to such private employments as directly menace the health, the moral and economic influence which such legislation exercises upon all classes of labor is fully appreciated. In resisting this influence the government contractors take the ground that the reduction of the hours of labor on private work would place them at a disadvantage in competing with other nations. In a word, the argument against the reduction of hours is an argument in favor of maintaining the power of American labor to underbid the so-called "cheap pauper labor" of Europe.¹ The final outcome of the struggle for American supremacy in competition has been very clearly pointed out in a statement made in a recent publication by the State Department on the subject, as follows:²

"There is food for thought also in the possible consequences to our European trade of a rivalry on our part which may be so crushing as greatly to impair the purchasing power of those who are now our best customers. If we permanently cripple their chief industries, we deprive them, to a greater or less extent, of the means of buying from us, and the consumption of our food supplies and our raw materials, as well as of our finished goods, may be greatly curtailed. The solution of the problem may perhaps be found in the gradual specialization of commerce and industry, according to the peculiar capacity of each competing nation—the survival, in other words, of the fittest conditions for this or that country—and the gradual subsidence of competition into *healthful exchange*."

The reasoning upon which this forecast is based has an equally direct, and even more immediate, bearing upon the internal affairs of the country. In the present epoch, therefore, the movement for a shorter working-day appeals with renewed force to the common sense of the workers as a logical and conservative step toward the highest point of production and morals.

WALTER MACARTHUR.

¹ See Senate Document, No. 318, 55th Congress, 2d Session.

² "A General Survey of the Foreign Trade," Consular Reports, Feb. 13, 1901.

THE ETHICS OF LOOT.

THE coming of the allied forces to Tientsin, Pekin, Pao-ting-fu, and the metropolitan provinces of Chihli has given rise to the use of the Hindustani word "loot," probably from the unique presence of Indian troops. The interest which is displayed the world over in stories of looting is only equalled by the interest which is taken in the actual thing. Generals, governments, ministers plenipotentiary, globe-trotters, war correspondents, soldiers, marines, Cossacks, Sepoys, European ruffians, Chinese converts, missionaries, merchants, lovers of art, adventurers, Chinese *literati*, and western *littérateurs* — even the dull mind of Mark Twain — have all been looting, speculating in looted goods, longing for loot, or diagnosing the right thereof. As a member of one of these classes — I will not say of which kind — I venture to expound the ethics of loot.

Loot means spoils of war. If there has been no war, looting may be set down as wrong. If wrong there has been, it has been in making war, whether by the Chinese imperial government or by the combined troops of Europe, America, and Asia, and not in the incidental result of the collection of spoils.

The Emperor of China, or, more properly speaking, the Dowager Empress, speaking in the name of the sovereign and backed by Manchu noblemen and conservative mandarins, declared war against all outside nations, because the admirals of some of these nations had demanded the surrender of the Taku forts. These admirals were senseless sinners, if there was no reason for their action. Their threat as mere bluster was criminal. They forced the hand of China, and, in so doing, entrapped in the trap of bloodshed, outrage, and malice their own countrymen, not only in Pekin, but in all the provinces of North China. But these warriors of the sea read the times, and were quick to act. Pekin was already cut off from the world by the growing hordes of turbulent Boxers, and the plot was set to move the troops in such a way that Tientsin would be cut off from Taku and the sea, and that the doom of the legations at Pekin would thus be sealed. If wrong there has been, it has been in the indifference to existing friction, a fault of both Chinese and foreign-

ers, and in the reliance upon the arts of peace to the exclusion of the art of war.

If the Chinese imperial government — I do not say China — had contented itself with waging war according to recognized usages, China's friends from abroad would have given her help, and would have stood as her advocates in the judicial court of the world. But facts were otherwise. Those representing the sovereignty of this ancient people gave heed to outlaws; spurned sober counsel; trampled on justice; closed the gates of liberty; poured out the revenues to those who sought innocent blood; laughed at the rights of nations and the sacredness of the person of foreign representatives; let loose their vials of wrath, and opened a carnival of hell; defied holy compacts, cherished friendships, humanity, law, retribution, high heaven; sentenced to death every foreigner and every Christian within their borders; turned the prince's palace and the governor's *yamen* into an altar of human sacrifice; poured from the palace itself shot and shell, as well as edict; slaughtered over 240 helpless men, women, and children, who did no harm as they dwelt in the land, and with them over 30,000 native followers of the Christian faith; gloated wildly over their indecencies and pandemonium in their day of strength; and, in their day of weakness, when 40,000 foreign troops — Christian, Hindoo, Buddhist, Mohammedan — came marching on, left their palaces, their people, their blood-stained swords, the throne, the wealth, the confusion, the recompense, and the doom, and fled to the mountains.

For the crime thus committed by the instigation of the Manchu court, it seemed at the moment that no punishment could be too severe. "Raze the city to the ground!" "Burn the palace!" "Let ruins mark the site of the greatest crime of the century, and prove a warning to coming centuries." I am not sure, in the new moments of reflection, after six months of wearying negotiations of peace, with defiance, disdain, callousness, and self-complacency still writ large over every deed of the Dowager Empress and her closest counsellors, but that the first thought, if carried out, would have been for the greatest good of the greatest number. As a mild modification of such drastic proposals there grew up the romantic system of looting.

The first feature of looting may be spoken of as foraging or commandeering for the necessities of the foreign military. Before the arrival of the troops — none too soon for the safety of the besieged legations — every shop in the city had been closed, deserted, or already looted by the native soldiery, the Boxers, or the populace. There was no vegetable

or meat market. Fodder and grain could only be found in the surrounding country, in private houses of the well-to-do, and in a few shops. The foreign houses had all been destroyed, except those in the legation quarter, and even these were unsuited to the immediate needs of the allied forces. Commodious quarters were needed and were taken — the Imperial Carriage Park, the Temple of Heaven, the Temple of Agriculture, the Six Boards, the palaces of several princes, and the residences of wealthy mandarins. Fodder, food, horses, cattle, blankets, clothing, furniture, and dishes were seized according to need, and were distributed among officers and men, until commissariat supplies began to arrive, native shops were opened, and street marketing was resumed. All this was recognized as a legitimate part of campaigning. The only way for the Chinese to have prevented it was never to have gone to war.

Similar to this was the first and principal looting by foreign civilians, including the missionaries, and by the native converts and attendants. The quarters of the British legation had been set apart for nearly two months for the use of over 400 foreigners and nearly that number of Chinese, while in adjoining buildings, sheds, and open courts there were congregated nearly 2,300 Christian refugees. In the buildings connected with the North Cathedral, which was defended by only forty French and Italian marines, were over 3,200 Catholic refugees. When the siege was raised most of these people had to move out, especially those who were quartered on the legations. Their homes were gone, and the houses of others must be occupied, and that at once. Most of the missions sought out quarters sufficient for their converts as well as for the missionaries. The only ones especially lenient were those who had no Chinese to care for. Nearly all who thus took temporary possession of other people's property did so with the special sanction of their ministers and the military. In some cases the houses had been already deserted by their conscience-stricken owners; in other cases the owners offered hospitality to avoid a looting of another kind far more severe.

Properly speaking, such occupation of houses — the billeting of soldiers and missionaries upon the town — is not a case of looting; but the fundamental principle being the same, namely, taking under force of war that which belongs to another, the incident is worth mentioning. A clear case of looting is the taking of grain, rice, fodder, fuel, and clothing from deserted houses and shops. If the task of avoiding famine during the siege was a difficult one, it was almost as difficult to get anything to eat during the first few days after the siege. The obtaining of supplies could not be delayed, unless theory required that those saved during the

siege should die of starvation afterward. As there were no shops open to trade — an outcome of the imperial support of the Boxer rising — there was no payment to be made, and in many cases no one to take a payment. Learned divines trained in the theology of Calvin and Arminius could recall no teaching applicable to these new conditions, and unhesitatingly proceeded to take food wherever found. The kind Dowager Empress forgot to make arrangements for our wants during the siege and after; but during each period we adapted ourselves to circumstances, and got along.

Owing to the fact that two of the missions, both connected with the American Board, succeeded in occupying the palaces of two princes, there arose an opportunity — the only one of a lifetime — to put up for sale looted goods. It is this affair that has made the stir. One prince was of the number of the eight hereditary princes, among whom Prince Chuang was the most notorious; and it seemed to be taken for granted that none of these should be spared, or that they at least should suffer before the common people. The other prince was a Mongol, who lived adjoining the destroyed premises of the American Board, and whose palace had been turned into Boxer headquarters. Within a day after the siege was raised, Rev. Dr. Ament boldly dashed into the palace and took possession. With the approval of the foreign authorities the property within was confiscated; "shop" was open; generals, members of the *corps diplomatique*, and those too conscientious to loot came to buy at moderate prices the looted goods; and the proceeds formed part of a fund to indemnify the native Christians. Several who hurried to buy the loot hurried away to "write the missionary up." To confiscate the property of those who were enemies in war may be theoretically wrong, but precedent establishes the right.

A somewhat similar mode of looting was that of entering houses other than those occupied, and taking the best that could be found. Old residents of Pekin not only knew where the wealth was, but generally distinguished between the Chinaman who was a friend and him who was a foe. For the former they sought protection; from the latter, loot. Personally, I regret that the guilty suffered so little at my own hands, though others, Chinese as well as foreigners, spared nothing when the attack once began. In fact, for the first four days, looting was all the fad. The troops of the different nationalities secured their rest through "change of occupation." To them the question was not so much, which Chinaman was the worst, but which house was the richest. There was hardly a house or shop that was not entered by some one. The Chinese sought immunity whenever possible; but even when looted

they made little complaint, being grateful that their lives were spared or their houses left standing. They expected that the whole city would suffer for the crime of its rulers. Their solidarity afforded no escape to the individual. Protection, when it came, was all the more appreciated.

As soon as the foreign powers decided on preserving Pekin, with the imperial palaces, the city was divided into sections for military control by the leading powers. The commanders of the contingents united in issuing orders which forbade all looting. To loot was then to plunder. As war passed into peace, and order began to prevail, the law became more than a formal utterance. It was finally enforced. The only looting permissible was that which military authorities directed. All the property of Boxers was officially confiscated. The Japanese, unmolested, captured over a million taels of silver from the Board of Revenue. The French captured nearly 200,000 taels from the palace of Prince Li, the head of the cabinet. These amounts, I understand, will be deducted from the full indemnity. What the Russians seized at the Summer Palace is unknown to outsiders. The Americans captured the imperial granary, and the Japanese another government granary. During the winter some of the rice thus secured was distributed among the poor Chinese.

The British commander, seeing the wild disorder produced by indiscriminate looting, and realizing the bad effects it would have on the discipline of the Indian troops, placed all looting under the command of officers. The supply was large. The loot godown and the loot auctions at the British legation furnished popular relaxation for those who had passed through the fatigue and perils of the march on Pekin; and the proceeds afforded a slight recompense to the officers and men who were the first to enter the Tartar city and relieve the beleaguered. It was all a part of the official direction of a memorable campaign against the Dowager and her satellites, who had dared to defy the world and insult mankind.

The looting inaugurated in Pekin was practised wherever foreign troops marched to punish and to occupy. The Germans and the French were especially active. Their zeal may, perhaps, be excessive according to American ideas, their treatment of the Chinese harsh, and their punishments devoid of equitable discrimination; but it should never be forgotten that prior to the victories of the allied forces the whole country was teeming with Boxers, that nearly every family was contributing to the support of the Boxers, and that every Christian desiring to live had to flee, to recant, or to combine with others for protection against Boxers and imperial

troops. The looting in connection with the occupation was mostly in the way of foraging for the support of the troops. Besides this, many fines were inflicted on different districts for the outrages previously committed.

Two causes of complaint have existed in connection with these punitive expeditions. First, the Chinese troops which were needed to help the authorities in maintaining order were driven outside the line of occupation, and no substantial authority with power to enforce was established in place of the native government. Secondly, these expeditions continued after negotiations of peace had begun; but the error here was that talk about peace began too soon. The looting was a minor consideration in the whole problem of carrying on war, when war had been declared by one side only.

The eccentricities of this unique campaign were emphasized by certain missionary exploits. The most noted participant was Rev. Dr. Ament, who, by the way, was as brave a man as the siege produced, a man of determined energy, broad sympathies, and self-sacrificing devotion. He and others have not been accused of looting during these country tours, but have been misunderstood for their efforts to indemnify the native Christians. When it became evident that the foreign ministers would not take into account the losses of Chinese converts, the missionaries boldly approached the local authorities, who, in turn, offered to indemnify those among their own people who had suffered through their adherence to the Christian faith. The missionaries made out a list of losses, so far as Americans were concerned, and asked for moderate compensation. In comparison with the indemnity to foreigners these amounts are a mere bagatelle. Looting, extortion, and blackmailing existed; but the charges cannot be laid at the door of American or English missionaries.

The first place for looting has generally been given to Pekin, but Tientsin is perhaps more entitled to the honor. Pekin is prominent because the great men have been here. The number of one's friends is now proportioned to the amount and value of one's loot. As America has resisted war, and as her troops came merely to relieve the legations — alas, for the Americans in Pekin if there had been no legations! — strict ethics should require that no American be found with loot. For those who have known the facts and have passed through a war of awful memory, the matter of loot is only one of high ethics.

GILBERT REID.

THE LIBERAL PARTY: A MENACE TO ENGLISH DEMOCRACY.

If party and fundamental party principles were one and the same thing, such a sinister suggestion as that of the title of this article would be puerile. Or, if the ordinary man would take the trouble to discriminate between the two, democracy could afford to disregard it.

What need to recapitulate the splendid services which Liberalism has rendered to democracy? What need to contrast them with the hostility of Conservatism? And yet, strange as it may sound in some ears, it is necessary to affirm and re-affirm the fact that to-day the open hostility of Conservatism is not worth considering when compared with the insidious danger that threatens democracy in the attitude of that party — the Liberal party — which used to be its valiant vanguard and its watchful rear.

Let us once more set forth the fundamental principles, the aims, and the policy which have in the past attracted and held men, more or less completely, to one or other of the great English political parties. Let us give some account of them which would be likely to be accepted as impartial by the parties themselves. They have their roots deep down in the history of the English people; but it is not necessary to the present purpose to trace their evolution.

The modern Conservatives are the immediate and natural successors of the Tories of the Revolution period. They have always been enthusiastically loyal to the Crown and to all that the Crown stands for: the aristocratic and exclusive as opposed to the democratic and popular; the privileges of the few as opposed to the demands of the many. For, unlike their predecessors, the Tories, they have been spared the problem of a king *de jure* and a king *de facto*. They are, in short, the modern remnant of feudalism, though even they themselves could not but admit that, in these latter days, they represent only one-half of the great feudal idea; they have retained its emoluments while ignoring the duties which feudalism used to impose. Policy has been the consistent and logical outcome of principle. Conservatives as a party have denounced as dan-

gerous, and have opposed, every demand for extension of the power of the common people, whether it has related to the franchise, to popular education, or to protection from the privileges of the land-owner or the capitalist. When the Protestant Succession became firmly established, they abjured Roman Catholicism, and have ever since warmly supported that compromise, the High Ritualistic State Church. Above all, broadly speaking, the Conservative party has been the war party. War suits its interests and its policy. War gives employment and promotion to the younger sons of the idle classes; war and conquest are supposed to open up new markets for big commercial undertakings; war draws the eyes of the nation to distant parts of the earth, and postpones popular demands for reform at home. When the nation is at war it is easy to persuade it that national honor and national existence depend on a strenuous maintenance and extension of international rights, rather than on a strenuous maintenance and extension of national and popular rights.

The modern Liberals have been worthy successors of the Whigs, who finally repudiated the doctrine of the divine right of kings. They accepted, and have over and over again tacitly affirmed, the great Whig principle that in England monarchy is a contract between king and people, and that the right of the king to reign continues so long only as he keeps his half of the contract. Practically, the Liberal party has included within itself the whole body of religious Nonconformity, which has stood for religious freedom, with its inevitable consequences, freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Almost every extension of the franchise, of popular education, of the rights of the people as against the claims of the land-owner, the capitalist, and the monopolist has been carried by Liberal governments, or else wrested by Liberal oppositions from Conservative governments. The thing that is here put last is the thing which the Liberal party of a past day used to put first among the three great vital and primary necessities of life, the life of Liberalism — peace.

It probably would be possible to show, however, as a matter of actual history, that the Liberal party has been involved in war to as large an extent as the Conservative party. But there would be a fallacy in such a demonstration. In order to prove this, it will be necessary to consider briefly some facts and figures bearing on the history of the two parties. Party government, as we now understand it, came in at the time of the Revolution. It was a natural consequence of the gradual formation within the Privy Council of the "Cabinet," that dominating factor in modern English politics. The whole subject forms a most in-

teresting study in political evolution. But in the 200 years of the history of party government nothing is more remarkable than the game of see-saw which the two great parties have played. The extreme limit of duration of a Parliament is fixed by statute at seven years, but the actual average is very much shorter. During the last century, which well covers the period of activity of the modern parties, there were thirty-two distinct administrations: sixteen Liberal, fifteen Conservative, and one Conservative-Unionist. In the matter of duration, the Conservatives have had the advantage. They have held the reins of government rather longer than fifty-five years, as against the forty-four years of the Liberals; and, also, their longest period of power was twenty years (1807 to 1827) as against the Liberal seven years (1859 to 1866). Of the whole thirty-two administrations nine did not remain in existence for a complete year, and the average for one hundred years works out at three years and a little over forty-five days. It is very easy to understand that the policy, especially the foreign policy, of an incoming administration must be largely influenced and determined by that of its predecessor. And if these figures are kept in mind, it is also easy to see that, while human nature is what it is, the party of peace must be largely at the mercy of the party of war. It is notoriously easier to make war than to make peace, easier to arouse national and racial animosities and jealousies than to allay them; and a broad and just consideration of the history of the parties shows that again and again Liberal ministries have come into office trammelled and hampered by foreign and international complications and quarrels, the legacies of a preceding Tory or Conservative government.

Surely no one can deny that the limits, the dividing lines, between the two sets of ideas have been sharp and keen; and so long as the Conservative party meant Conservatism, and the Liberal party Liberalism, democracy was safe. It must be confessed, however, that there have been times when having eyes it saw not, and having ears it heard not. But to any one who has stood outside the clash of political life in England during the last few years, it must have been obvious that certain changes have been going on, silently and subtly for the most part, but with occasional manifest outbreaks. And to-day it would appear that the Liberal party and the Conservative party are for practical purposes almost identical; that fundamental differences in principles no longer govern action; and the completeness of the fusion of policy is not more astonishing than its rapidity, so far at least as can be traced by outward observation.

How has the change come about? It may be instructive to ask, first of all, whether the Conservative party has become permeated with Liberal principles, and has adopted the aims and policy of its opponents. The attempts of Liberalism to form and keep an atmosphere in which it has a chance to assert itself are well summed up in the old Liberal watchwords — Peace, Retrenchment, and Reform. Certainly, the English Conservative party stands acquitted before the world of having "dished the Whigs" to the extent of deliberately pursuing peace, retrenchment, and reform. It is none the less true, however, that Conservatism itself has progressed, intellectually at all events, since it succeeded Toryism. It has never wanted reform, but, nevertheless, it has had to accept it — not on principle, but sometimes as policy, and sometimes, more often, under protest. It must be admitted that the modern Conservative is a very different person from his prototypes, the Cavalier and the Tory.

But if the Conservative party has progressed, or, rather, has been driven or dragged along, what has the Liberal party been doing? As we have seen, it has forced reforms on the Conservatives, and they themselves have been unable to withstand altogether the "spirit of the age." No one knows better than the orthodox Conservative that Toryism, the divine right of privilege and exclusion, has gone forever. Conservatism is a different thing. Conservatism relies entirely on its own strength and its own self-interest to protect it as long as may be from the flood-tide of democracy; and, moreover, it probably has an uncomfortable suspicion, underlying all its arrogance, that after all the voice of the people may be the voice of God, or, at least, the voice of destiny. "What is Conservatism?" a local magnate was asked by a young American lady, and after a short pause the reply came, "Sticking by each other." This change of ground means much. Unless it can be shown that Liberalism has progressed in the same or a bigger ratio, and the Liberal party with it, it is reasonable to suppose, the above conclusion being accepted, that this in itself has tended to lessen the distance between the van of the one force and the rear of the other. Few people would be bold enough to assert that Liberalism has progressed during the last five years. But the very recent history of the Liberal party goes far to prove that political life is subject to the same great law which governs moral and physical life, and which is generally regarded as an axiom. It is impossible to remain stationary; progress offers one alternative only — retrogression.

But retrogression, even as an outward and visible sign, takes us back

much farther than that. It began fifteen years ago, or appeared to do so, with the famous Chamberlain apostasy. It is no part of the present purpose to discuss that event, so far as it relates to Mr. Joseph Chamberlain himself. Without underestimating the importance of that aspect, it is true to say that the occasion bore a much larger significance. It was a test. The opportunity was seized by a large body of men within the Liberal ranks to draw back from a party which had been progressing too fast for them. The apostates were chiefly men who had been born Liberals, who had inherited the Liberal tradition in much the same way as they had inherited the name of their family. Men of this stamp are often the most faithful not only to party, but to principles, so long as party issues hang upon principles whose form is familiar and understood. But they fail when old principles change their form, and present themselves in new guises and in new lights. These men were all careful to explain that they were still Liberals, and in harmony with the policy of Mr. Gladstone in every particular except the one question of Home Rule for Ireland. Truly, principles and beliefs are slight things so long as they are not brought to big practical issues.

But the career of Liberal Unionists has proved how impossible it is for men to deny even one logical outcome of a great fundamental and root theory, and yet continue faithful to it. Is it not true that the Unionist party has drifted back and back to rank Conservatism? Is it to be distinguished except in name from the Conservative party? "Nobody wastes time nowadays in dwelling on the identity of Liberal-Unionism with Conservatism . . . the vaunted partition has of course disappeared long ago," remarked the "Liverpool Daily Post" just before the general election.

The next great crisis in the history of the Liberal party was the death of Mr. Gladstone. The effect of that event on the morale of his followers has been discussed from almost every point of view. The personal ascendancy of Gladstone illustrated the mingled strength and weakness of human nature. Liberalism *was* Gladstone; the living principles were incarnated in that tremendous personality, that grand heroic figure. Democratic ideas were no longer dim abstractions, vague philosophic truths. Clothed with human reality, spiritualized by human pity and tenderness, illuminated by a clear and shining intellect, they had spoken to the hearts and consciences of men; they had been made manifest to the meanest intelligence; they had appealed to all that is most aspiring in human nature. They no longer pleaded for concessions; they demanded rights that had been usurped, and repaid with scorn in-

tensified a hundredfold the scorn which had been poured out upon them. The tendency, in short, was to abandon the defensive and assume the offensive attitude. "No man is necessary." The old hackneyed phrase is a mere truism if by "man" is meant simply the material, visible, presence. But if life, soul, spirit is meant, it at once becomes an inane absurdity. Gladstone passed, and with him Liberalism, that is, a certain conception of lofty ideas which had done a marvellous work for England and for the world. It was buried with him, as some one mournfully said. But in the widest and truest sense Gladstone was necessary, is necessary; Gladstone is undying, and the great truths underlying Gladstonian Liberalism are undying, though ever changing with the changing ages of the world.

But the Liberal party of to-day does not grasp this; it is hide-bound by tradition. It looks back instead of forward. Liberals assure us that they have given up nothing; they hold to their old beliefs. Precisely: but that is merely a phase of Conservatism. There are fresh conceptions of human liberty and progress, but the Liberal party does not accept them; and meanwhile the age with its new and tremendous ideas is rushing past, leaving Liberalism itself stranded high and dry. The men who in the days to come will shake themselves free and help to found a great new National Democratic party must be daily finding their fetters, as nominal members of the Liberal party, more and more intolerable.

One of the most significant features of the present party is its inability to produce leaders. There is neither the inspiration of a great dominating personality to animate the mass, nor is there that great helpless, formless passion in the mass which has never yet failed to kindle heroism in some man capable of giving it expression and direction. A party which is compelled to choose its leaders! No movement that is possessed by great and vital truths ever need descend to the expedient of choosing a leader. The whole history of the progressive forces that have moved the world proves it. A party may formally ratify and acknowledge a leadership, but the real appointment is beyond the control of a party caucus. However strongly one may repudiate the divine right of kings and of privilege, one is compelled to subscribe to a doctrine of the divine right of leaders!

Mr. Gladstone's death and all that event involved, in the loosening of old bonds and the questioning of old beliefs and old policy, made it almost inevitable that a state of chaos should prevail, and that the work of the re-formation and reorganization of the paralyzed forces should be one which would require time and patience. It was unfortunate that

no strenuous appeal from outside should have come early to its aid, no question big enough to inspire the scattered groups with a common purpose. A great reaction to Conservatism had set in, aided more than ever before by the growing power of materialism. The old Toryism was bad enough when viewed from the intellectual standpoint. Ethically it towered high above its successor, inasmuch as it fought largely for an ideal. The ideal was a false one, the outcome of a sentiment which did violence to reason; but even false ideals are better than none. This view may be fairly held while one is bound to admit that history shows a long record of fiendish deeds done by men who were not bad, deeds which were the perfectly natural outcome of false ideals which prompted them. To reconcile the contradiction has been the standing problem of the moral philosopher.

But modern Conservatism, frankly fighting for itself, has dropped all pretence of idealism; it has no conception outside its own interests. It is inspired purely by the gospel of materialism; for it must be noted that it has adopted commercialism not only as its chief support, but also as its chief aim. It no longer scorns money-making, even when in the pursuit it has to descend to undisguised trading. Perhaps democracy might have had little cause to lament this, had commercialism simply changed sides: the removal of a growing element of weakness would have been no cause for regret. But, unfortunately, the same thing has helped to work the ruin of the Liberal party. It has caught the infection: it no longer sees its Holy Grail in the old work for the uplifting of the people; it has no time and no inclination for that. Its vision has become so distorted that it can see nothing less huge than an Empire—not an Empire which is great because of the greatness and grandeur of the peoples who are the Empire, but a materialistic Empire to be won and to be held by the sword. And, strange conjunction, it is a military Empire which is to be one vast shop, a sort of universal store. We are to be no longer a mere nation of shopkeepers, but an Empire of shopkeepers. It is foolish and it is wicked. The true work of the Liberal party is to-day, no less than it was in the past, the lifting of the people to higher and ever higher levels, physically, morally, and intellectually. It is doubtless true that much the greater part of the specific work it set out to do is done. It has achieved political freedom for the people of England; it has put the means of great—almost unbounded—power into the hands of the English democracy. And, having done this, its knights have taken sword and shield, and are following “strange fires,” while their nation reels back into the beast.

The tragedy that is interwoven with the dying of one century and the dawning of another will probably be the memory which, in the future, will stand out from all other national memories in the mind of every British man and woman who has taken part in it either as actor or witness. Eighteen months ago a great opportunity presented itself, an opportunity that, if it had been seized by the Liberal party in Parliament and in the country, would have meant new birth, political salvation for the present, and an unbounded horizon for future greatness. Eighteen months ago the rank and file were waiting for the "leaders" to speak out, and denounce the threatened reversion to barbarism. Then, as the weeks went on, the idea grew that the Liberal leaders must be in the confidence of the government, that there must be facts to justify their silence, a silence which remained unbroken with one honorable exception, that of Mr. John Morley. But we know the story now. There *was* nothing to know, except what any man might learn who cared enough for the honor of his country and of humanity. And, as the months have gone on, guilt has been heaped on guilt.

Mr. Labouchere has told the world since, that the Colonial Secretary assured the Liberal leaders there would be no war in South Africa, as a timely display of force would cause the Boers to yield. But does that explanation of the silence of the Liberal party clear it from guilt? Is it not morally and politically as bad to press unjust demands and to coerce by threats of force as actually to employ force? These prophetic words from one of the silent voices were strangely predictive; they were spoken by Mr. Gladstone half a century ago:

"I, for my part, am of opinion that Britain will stand shorn of a chief part of her glory and pride if she shall be found to have separated herself, through the policy she pursues abroad, from the moral support which the general and fixed convictions of mankind afford—if the day shall come when she may continue to excite the wonder and fear of other nations, but in which she shall have no part in their affection and regard. Let it not be so. Let us recognize, and recognize with frankness, the equality of the weak with the strong—the principles of brotherhood among nations, and of their sacred independence. When we are asking for the maintenance of the rights which belong to our fellow-subjects abroad, let us do as we would be done by, and let us pay that respect to a feeble state and to the infancy of free institutions which we should desire and should exact toward their maturity and strength."

Such sentiments are all very well when used in the way of harmless quotations. It would scarcely be safe to plagiarize them in a meeting of the Liberal party to-day, or, perhaps it would be fairer to say, of twelve months ago. If the private experiences of the few men and women who were brave enough to condemn the policy of the government in South Africa could be written, a strange light would be thrown on the conduct

of numberless individual members of the party of liberty, of peace, and of free speech. It would be difficult to prove that it was guilty of joining in the howls and stone-throwing which were the fashionable controversial weapons used to silence the peace advocates in public; but its private conduct was not conducive to a belief in its entire innocence. The Liberal party is not quite so bellicose to-day. Circumstances have treated it cruelly, and it now finds the South African war an uncomfortable subject of conversation. Let us hope that repentance will follow the chastening, and that it will repudiate Jingoism and all its ways!

But who can believe that the future of democracy rests with a party which stood by while a Conservative government made war upon a free people at the bidding of commercial exploiters, which has raised no protest at the barbarous conduct of that war, and which has concurred in the annexation of two free republics? And that is the least part of the affair. The Liberal party, to a very large extent, has gloried in the war, has spread the war spirit, has preached war from hundreds of Liberal platforms and in hundreds of Nonconformist pulpits. And it has persecuted the few who have been faithful, and who have dared to denounce war, the war spirit, and all that war stands for. Is it not a fact patent to thoughtful and observant Englishmen to-day that if this party had not betrayed the heritage of the great past, we should have been saved, not perhaps from war, but from the worst consequences of the war, the moral degradation into which we have fallen? It was the sacred duty of the Liberal party to come to the rescue of the unthinking mob, whose instincts and passions are strong, but whose brains are weak, and which is always ready to follow, but cannot walk alone.

Many an honest Liberal will doubt the fairness of all this; but let such an one consider how, in order to support a war which, in Mr. Chamberlain's biting phrase, "they do not approve, but dare not oppose," Liberals have had to deny more than one fundamental theory. History is repeating itself. Even non-Liberals are uttering much the same sort of talk as Liberals uttered fifteen years ago,—Liberals who are now the warmest supporters of Jingoism and of a Conservative government. "When this war is over and out of the way, Liberalism will have a chance; these are the days of temptation in the wilderness." The plea is a pathetic one. Great movements and great progressive parties have had to suffer all the despair and sense of defeat that are conveyed in the idea. But the Liberal party shows a strong inclination to linger in the wilderness of temptation, and even to bargain with the devil who is showing it all the kingdoms of the earth, and the glory of them; it does not

seem to be in any particular hurry to tell this particular tempter to get behind it. Is it likely to come forth from the wilderness in triumph?

A review of the speeches of the candidates at the recent general election would be instructive. First of all, let the advice be noted which "The Times" gave to Unionists to refrain from opposing Liberal candidates who were in agreement with the government in its South African policy. Obviously nothing else mattered. A Liberal was harmless if only he would shout for war; he was just as useful as a Conservative — probably more so. About the same time, Mr. John Albert Bright, John Bright's son, declared that "the main differences of the Unionists with the Liberals are fast receding." We have often been told that there is no such thing as political gratitude. If there is not, it is difficult to say why the Liberal party polled such an enormous number of votes; the bigness of Lord Salisbury's majority, so far, at least, as is shown by the contested elections, having been proved to be largely due to one of the defects in our system of Parliamentary representation.

The general election was unique in its way. It differed in a marked degree from any of its immediate predecessors. A general election in England used to be a lively experience. What a tremendous programme the Liberal party used to draw up, and how the Conservatives used to sneer at its Utopianism! Party spirit ran high, and we were told what a mischievous thing it was. People who were strong Liberals or strong Conservatives were reproved by well-intentioned folks who are fond of quoting certain well-worn lines of Macaulay's, quite oblivious of the fact that they are a mild satire upon themselves. It is to be hoped that the conduct of the general election satisfied them. But the men who have honestly contended for the necessity of party — a responsible government, and an opposition which watches and criticises — will find in the election of 1900 some justification for their theories. No one has ever contended that party government was the ideal government, but simply that it was an effort of human nature to counteract a certain tendency to corruption, which unchecked political power brings with it.

Truly, the Britons were like brothers. It was quite a family affair. Plenty of squabbling about family matters, but all in the most brotherly way; no interference allowed from outsiders. If any one ventured to criticise the affairs of this family party, the members of it immediately dropped their fraternal differences and turned on the outsider. The great matter it had in hand was a big war in South Africa. Some thought the government had not managed the thing well, and had not crushed the Boers quickly enough; others defended the government; others, again,

blamed the generals, and said they had been too humane; some blamed this department, some blamed that department. But it was not a party matter. The candidates—Liberals, Conservatives, and Liberal-Unionists—made speeches and wrote letters either blaming or excusing the government, the War Office, and the generals; insisted on the “necessity” for annexation; and then, at the end of the address, letter, or speech, disposed, in a few careless sentences, of such trifles as the housing problem, the drink traffic, old-age pensions, etc., etc., regretting how impossible it was to pay any attention to them just then. And the regret of the Conservative or Liberal-Unionist candidate was just as deep as the regret of the Liberal candidate, so far as an ordinary person could judge.

Well, the general election was over some months ago, and practically one question has since then absorbed the attention of the new Parliament and of the country, the question of army reform. And the upshot of all the quarrels and recriminations about the war is this: we are threatened with conscription in the near future. More definite still, we are duly notified that conscription, compulsory military service, is within the area of practical politics, and will certainly be imposed within a given time unless certain changes take place, which, however, no one seems to expect to see.

The “Nineteenth Century and After” for April, 1901, had two short articles on “Our Last Effort for a Voluntary Army” from different points of view, the civil and the military. The civilian writer boldly describes Mr. Brodrick’s scheme as the swan-song of the purely voluntary system. Some sentences from the article by the military contributor, Major-General Frank S. Russell, C.M.G., are worth reproducing and are to be commended to the attention of every British democrat who has at heart the uplifting of the people of his own land; who believes in national and international righteousness; who has a passionate conviction that war is the last and the worst enemy of democracy; and who has no desire to see liberty-loving England put herself under the heel of a military despotism like those of the continent. Major-General Russell said:

“We are not ready for it [compulsory service] yet, but that it will come and must come sooner or later in some shape or form there can scarcely be any reasonable doubt.”

Then the writer goes on to express a fear that such a proposal might be defeated by being made a party cry, and remarks naively:

“As long as we have the present system of government by party, conscription or compulsion would form an invaluable party cry for the Radical party, although in all social matters compulsory powers, compulsory acquisition of land, compulsion in the many varied incidents of municipal and local government form the principal planks

of their political platform. It is notoriously unwise to hazard a prophecy, but it would seem tolerably certain that, if any form of compulsory service for the army is ever to be proposed and carried with the practically unanimous assent of the nation, it must be initiated by a Radical government, who, in such cases of national emergency, can rely on the loyal support of a Unionist opposition. It is true that the present leader has joined with the ex-leader of the Liberal party within the last few days in denouncing any form of compulsion in most uncompromising terms, but we have seen changes of opinion before among all classes of politicians. Such a change as this would not be the most complete or remarkable on record."

In plain English, plainer even than that of the military politician, the position is this: The military authorities, backed by the united Jingoism of the Conservative and Liberal-Unionist parties, want conscription. Conscription, however, if proposed by them, would be received with the greatest suspicion, would be made the subject of searching controversy, and, finally, would raise such a storm of opposition in the country that it might be defeated. But, then, there is the Radical party. Get it to propose conscription — not such a very startling suggestion after what it has done, and what it has not done. It has the confidence of the middle and working classes. Conscription under its auspices would "go down."

If militarism be one of the ideals of democracy; if the people of England should be content to remain, and to become, more completely than even they have been in the past the tools of a group of political gamesters, to be used by their masters for the purpose of crushing the democracies of "rival" nations; if they should not be capable of seeing that these other democracies and not kings, emperors, and big capitalists are their natural allies, let them be prepared to follow the present Liberal party. For, quite apart from the important circumstance that Lord Rosebery, who is certainly the ex-leader, and may again be the leader, has already declared for some form of conscription — though Major-General Russell appears to be either ignorant or incredulous of it — the recent conduct of the party generally has practically committed it to the support of the coming demand for conscription.

But, if it be indeed true that militarism is the last and worst enemy of democracy, let the various English democratic groups and societies unite in this one thing at least — let them beware how they put their trust in Neo-Liberalism. As well may democracy confide its future to a coalition of Conservatism and Liberal-Unionism, adorned with those strange hybrid blossoms of the political garden, the Tory-Democrat and the Liberal-Imperialist.

HATTIE E. MAHOOD.

IS THE ELECTIVE SYSTEM ELECTIVE?

IT is, perhaps, only natural, though it was scarcely to be expected, that the university which in the last year or two has most severely criticised the elective system is that which a quarter of a century ago deliberately advocated it, and in the face of almost universal opposition justified it in the eyes of American educators. There has evidently been a miscalculation. However, though Harvard has cautiously acknowledged its failure in the persons of no less authorities than Professor Müünsterberg and Dean Briggs, the element of error has not yet been clearly stated, nor has the remedy been proposed. Many things have been said against the elective system, but they may all be summed up in one phrase: it is not elective. This is no specious paradox. It is the offer of free election that is specious.

No offer could seem fairer. The student is at liberty to choose as he will. He may specialize microscopically or scatter his attention over the universe; he may elect the most ancient subjects or the most modern, the hardest or the easiest. No offer, I repeat, could seem fairer. But experience disillusioned. Some day or other a serious student wakes up to the fact that he is the victim of — shall we say a thimble-rigging game? For example, let us take the case of a serious specialist. Of all the world's knowledge the serious specialist values only one little plot. A multitude of courses is listed in the catalogue, fairly exhausting his field. Delightful! Clearly he can see which walnut-shell covers the pea. He chooses for his first year's study four courses — the very best possible selection, the only selection to open up his field. One moment: on closer scrutiny he finds that two of the four courses are given at the same hour, and that, therefore, he cannot take them in the same year. Still, there are at his command other courses, not so well adapted to his purposes, but sooner or later necessary. He chooses one. Hold again! On closer inspection he finds that appended to the course is a Roman numeral, and that the same numeral is against one of his other courses. After half an hour's search in the catalogue he finds that, though the two courses are given at different hours, and indeed on different days of

the week, the mid-year and final examinations in both take place on the same days. Obviously these two cannot be taken in the same year. With damped spirits his eye lights on a second substitute. He could easily deny himself this course; but it is vastly interesting, if not important, and he has a year's work to arrange. Behold, this most interesting course was given last year, and will be given next year, but neither love nor money nor the void of a soul hungering for knowledge could induce the professor who gives it to deliver one sentence of one lecture. He is busy and more than busy with another course which will not be given next year. The specialist is at last forced to elect a course he does not really want. One entanglement as to hours of which the present defendant had knowledge forced a specialist in Elizabethan literature to elect — and, being a candidate for a degree with distinction, to get a high grade in — a course in the history of finance legislation in the United States. This was a tragic waste, for so many and so minute are the courses offered that the years at the student's disposal are all too few to cover even a comparatively narrow field. The specialist may well ruminate on the philosophy of Alice and her Wonderland jam. Yesterday he could elect anything, and to-morrow anything; but how empty is to-day!

Highly as the modern university regards the serious specialist, a more general sympathy will probably be given to the man who is seeking a liberal education. Such a man knows that in the four years at his disposal he cannot gain any real scientific knowledge even of the studies of the old-fashioned college curriculum. As taught now, at Harvard, they would occupy, according to President Eliot's report for 1894-5, twice four years. But by choosing a single group of closely related subjects, and taking honors in it, he hopes to master a considerable plot of the field of knowledge. I will not say that he chooses the ancient classics, for — though they are admirably taught in a general way in the great Oxford Honor School of Literæ Humaniores — the American student may be held to require, even in studying the classics, a larger element of scientific culture, which would take more time than is to be had. For the same reason I will not say that he chooses the modern languages and literatures, though such a choice might be defended. Let us say that he chooses a single modern language and literature—his own. Surely this is not too large a field for four years' study.

Of classics, mathematics, science, and history he has supposedly been given a working knowledge in the preparatory school. For the rest he relies on the elective system. Even in the beginning, like the special-

ist, he is unable to choose the courses he most wants, because of the conflict of the hours of instruction and examination; and this difficulty pursues him year by year, increasing as the subjects to be taken grow fewer and fewer. But let us dismiss this as an incidental annoyance. His fate is foreshadowed when he finds that the multitude of courses by which alone he could cover the entire field of English literature would fill twice the time at his disposal. Already he has discovered that the elective system is not so very elective. He sadly omits Icelandic and Gothic and all but one of the courses in Anglo-Saxon. Some day he means to cover the ground by means of a history of literature and translations; but in point of fact, as the subjects are not at all necessary for his degree, and as he is overburdened with other work, he never does. He sticks to his last, and is the more willing to do so, because, being wise beyond the wont of undergraduates, he knows that it will be well to fortify his knowledge of the English language and literature with some knowledge of the history of the English people, and furthermore of the history and literature of the neighboring Germans and French.

Having scarcely time for a rapid survey of these complementary subjects, he elects only the introductory courses. In the aggregate they require many precious hours, and in order to take them he is obliged to omit outright the literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries; but he knows that it is better to neglect a detail or two than the buttresses of the edifice he is building. Again he has miscalculated. After his complementary courses are begun, and it is too late to withdraw from them, he discovers even more clearly than the specialist how very un-elective the elective system can be. It is the same old question of the thimble and the pea. The introductory courses are intended to introduce him to the study of history and of literature, not to complement his studies of English. He wanted to know in English history the social and the political movements, the vital and picturesque aspect of history; he is taught the sources and constitutions — the dry bones. He wanted to know in German and French the epochs of literature; he is taught the language, considered scientifically, or, at most, certain haphazard authors in whom he has only a superficial interest. If he is studying for honors he is obliged to waste enough time on these distracting courses to reach a high grade in each. The elective system is mighty, for he is a slave to it. This difficulty is typical. A student of history or of German who wants to study Elizabethan literature for its bearing on his subject is obliged to spend one full course — a quarter of a year's work — on the language of four or five plays of Shakspere before he is permitted to

take a half course on Shakspere as a literary figure; and even then all the rest of the Elizabethan period is untouched.

Let us suppose that our student of English is wary as well as wise, preternaturally wary, and leaves all complementary subjects to private reading — for which he has no time. He is then able to devote himself to the three or four most important epochs in English literature. He has to leave out much that is of importance, so that he cannot hope to gain a synoptic view of the field as a whole; but of his few subjects he will at least be master. Here at last is the thimble that covers the pea. Not yet! In four courses out of five of those devoted to the greatest writers, the teacher's attention is directed primarily to a very special and scientific study of the language; the examination consists in explaining linguistic cruxes. Literary criticism, even of the most sober kind, is quite neglected. If the student learns what he is taught he may attain the highest grades and the highest honors without being able in the end to distinguish accurately the spirit of Chaucer from that of Elizabethan literature.

Furthermore, not every student is well advised enough to know precisely what course he requires that he may attain his end. In order, for example, to gain an understanding of the verse forms and even the spirit of Middle English and Elizabethan English, it is necessary to know the older French and Italian; but, as it happened, our student was not aware of the fact until he broke his shins against it, and it was nobody's business to tell him of it. And, even if he had been aware of it, he could not have taken those subjects without leaving great gaps in his English studies. He has graduated *summa cum laude* and with highest honors in English; but he has not even a correct outline knowledge of his subject. His education is a thing of shreds and patches.

Whatever may be the aim of the serious student, the elective system is similarly fatal to it. The signal merit of the old-fashioned curriculum was that its insistence on the classics and mathematics insured a mental culture and discipline of a very high order, and of a kind that is impossible where the student elects only purely scientific courses, or courses in which he happens to be especially interested. Let us suppose that the serious student wishes to elect his courses so as to receive this discipline. His plight is indicated in "Some Old-fashioned Doubts about New-Fashioned Education" which have lately been divulged¹ by the Dean of Harvard College, Professor Le B. R. Briggs. The undergraduate "may choose the old studies but not the old instruction. In-

¹"Atlantic Monthly," October, 1900.

struction under an elective system is aimed at the specialist. In elective mathematics, for example, the non-mathematical student who takes the study for self-discipline finds the instruction too high for him; indeed, he finds no encouragement for electing mathematics at all." The same is true of the classics.

One kind of student, to be quite candid, profits vastly by the elective system, namely, the student whose artistic instinct makes him ambitious of gaining the maximum effect, an A. B., with the minimum expenditure of means. History D is a good course: the lectures do not come until eleven o'clock, and no thought of them blunts the edge of the evening before. Semitic C is another good course — only two lectures a week, and you can pass it with a few evenings of cramming. If such a man is fortunate enough to have learned foreign languages in the nursery or in travelling abroad, he elects all the general courses in French and German. This sort of man is regarded by Dean Briggs with unwonted impatience; but he has one great claim to our admiration. Of all possible kinds of students he alone has found the pea. For him the elective system is elective.

The men who developed the elective system, it is quite unnecessary to say, had no sinister intention. They were serious and scholarly teachers who revolted against the narrowness of the old curriculum, and to whom the nearest means of reform was suggested by the German plan. But the work of the elective system has been done, and the men who now uphold it are clogging the wheels of progress no less than those who fought it at the outset. The logic of circumstances has forced them to the theory that all knowledge is of equal importance, provided only that it is scientifically pursued. You may elect to study Shakspere and end by studying American finance legislation; but so long as you are compelled to study it scientifically, bless you, you are free.

The serenity of these men must of late have been somewhat clouded. Professor Hugo Münsterberg, as an editorial writer in "Scribner's Magazine" lately remarked, "has been explaining, gently but firmly, ostensibly to the teachers in secondary schools, but really to his colleagues in the Harvard faculty, that they are not imitating the German method successfully." In no way is the American college man in the same case as the German undergraduate. His preparatory schooling is likely to be three years in arrears, and, in any case, what he seeks is usually culture, not science. "The new notion of scholarship," this writer continues, "by which the degree means so much Latin and Greek, or the equivalent of them in botany or blacksmithing, finds no favor at all in what is sup-

posed to be the native soil of the 'elective system.' " Dr. Münsterberg's own words, guarded as they are, are not without point: "Even in the college two-thirds of the elections are haphazard, controlled by accidental motives; election, of course, demands a wide view and broad knowledge of the whole field. . . . A helter-skelter chase of the unknown is no election." The writer in "Scribner's" concludes: "It is not desirable that a man should sell his birthright for a mess of pottage, even if he gets the pottage. If he does not get it, as Dr. Münsterberg intimates, of course his state is even worse."

Rough as the elective system is on the student who aspires to be merely a scholar, it is worse on the undergraduate who wants to train his mind and equip it for business and professional life. To him a purely scientific training is usually a positive detriment. Scrupulous exactitude and a sense of the elusiveness of all knowledge are an excellent and indispensable part of the bringing up of a scholar; but few things are better fitted, if pursued exclusively, to check the self-confidence of a normal man and blight his will. Poor Richard had a formula for the case: "A hand-saw is a very good thing, but not to shave with." Before taking a vigorous hold on the affairs of Wall Street or of Washington, our recent graduates have first to get away from most of the standards that obtain in the university, or at least to supplement them by a host of others which they should have learned there. In another passage in the article already quoted Dean Briggs has touched the vital spot. He is speaking of the value to teachers of the peculiar fetish of Teutonized university instruction, the thesis, and of its liability to be of fictitious value. "Such theses, I suspect, have more than once been accepted for higher degrees; yet higher degrees won through them leave the winner farther from the best qualities of a teacher, remote from men and still more remote from boys. It was a relief the other day to hear a head-master say; 'I am looking for an under-teacher. I want first a man, and next a man to teach.'" What is true of teaching is even more obviously true of the great world of business and of politics. What it wants is men.

The cause of the break-down of the elective system, as at present constituted, is to be found in the machinery of instruction. The office of the teacher has become inextricably mixed up with a totally alien office — university discipline. Attendance at lectures is the only means of recording a student's presence in the university, and success in the examination in lecture courses is the only basis for judging of his diligence. At the tolling of a bell the student leaves all other affairs to report at a certain place. In the Middle Ages lectures were of necessity the main

means of instruction. Books were rare and their prices prohibitive. The master read and the student copied. To-day there are 400,000 books in the Harvard library. Only in the higher courses are lectures necessary or profitable. But still instruction is carried on, even in the most general courses, by means of professorial lectures. Where great periods are covered by leaps and bounds, freshness or individuality of treatment is quite impossible. The tolling of the college bell dooms hundreds of students to hear a necessarily hurried and inarticulate statement of knowledge which has been carefully handled in printed form by the most brilliant writers, and to which a tutor might refer the student in a few minutes' conference. Modify the lecture system? It is the foundation of the police regulation. The boasted freedom of the elective system enables the student to choose in what courses he shall be made the unwilling ally of the administrative officer. The lectures waste the time of the student and exhaust the energy of the teacher; but unless the lecturers give them and the studious attend, how can the university know that the shiftless stay away?

It is necessary for the administrator to judge of the student's success as well as of his diligence. Twice every year the professors hold an examination lasting for three hours in each of their several courses. Of late years an ingenious means has been devised for making the examination an even more perfect ally of the police. In the middle of each term an examination of one hour is held to ensure that the student has not only attended lectures but studied outside; and, in order to expose the procrastinator, it has become the custom for the examination to be given without warning. Like the lecture system, the examination system throws the onus of discipline on the studious and the teachers. Two thousand students write yearly 32,000 examination books. Quite obviously the most advanced of the professors cannot spare time for the Herculean task of reading and duly grading their share of these books. They give over most of them to underpaid assistants. The logical result of such a system is that the examinations tend to be regarded merely as statements of fact, and the reading of the books merely as clerical labor. At much less expense and travail they might test thoroughly not only a student's knowledge, but his method and power. If academic distinctions are disprized in America, both in college and out of it, this is amply explained by the fact that they attest a student's diligence rather than his ability. They are awarded, like a Sunday-school prize, in return for a certain number of good-conduct checks.

It is not enough that the machinery of instruction wastes the time

of the student and debases the office of the examiner; it is, as I have said, the cause of the break-down of the elective system. As long as each student is required to pursue every study under the eye of the disciplinarian, the decision as to what he shall study rests not with his desires or his needs, but with an elaborate schedule of lectures and examinations. So excessive are the evils of the present system that no less a man than Professor William James has advocated the abolition of the examinations.

This remedy is perhaps extreme; but the only alternative is almost as radical. It is to enable the student, at least the more serious student, to slip the trammels of the elective system, and instead to study rationally, and to be rationally examined in, the subject or group of subjects which he prefers. In a word, the courses of instruction should be organized into what the English call honor schools.

It may be objected that already it is possible to read for honors. The objection will scarcely convince any one who has ever taken the examination. It is oral, and occupies an hour or two. The men who conduct it are leading men in the department, and are often of worldwide reputation. They are so great that they understand the nature of the farce they are playing. No candidate is expected to have covered the field of his honor subject even in the broadest outlines. When the astute student is not sure of an answer, he candidly admits the fact and receives credit for knowing what he does not know — a cardinal virtue to the scientific mind. If I may be allowed a personal instance, I went up for the examination in English literature in complete ignorance as to all but a single brief movement. When my ignorances were laid bare, the examiners most considerately confined their questions to my period. We had much pleasant conversation. Each of the examiners had imparted in his courses his latest tid-bits of new light, and each in turn gave me the privilege of divulging these tid-bits to the others. For a brief but happy hour my importance was no less than that of the most eminent publication of the learned world. It need scarcely be said that such examinations are not supposed to have much weight in judging of the candidate's fitness. A more important test is a thesis studied from original sources, and the most important is good-conduct marks in a certain arbitrary number of set lecture courses. The policeman's examination is supreme.

If the chaos of the elective system is to be remedied, honors must be granted on some very different system. Perhaps the most useful example of what to emulate and what to avoid is to be found in the English

system of honor schools. While in the undivided American university the teaching and examining office remain identical, in England the college tutors lecture to, and consult with, their students, and the university board conducts the examination. Thus, when the field of learning expanded with the nineteenth century, the English university responded by adding, not a multiplicity of minute courses, but a series of well-conceived and well-ordered honor schools — Literæ Humaniores, Mathematics, History, Science, and the like. On the virtue of these honor schools there is not space to enlarge. I shall have to be content with saying that, by combining lecture courses with tutorial instruction and delegating the examining function to a university board, they insure precisely the freedom that is impossible under our elective system. As to their shortcomings I must be equally brief. Abetted by the power of endowed colleges, the tutors and tutorial lectures have stood in the way of advanced and university instruction; in the modern sense of the word Oxford is not properly a university. Clearly we should do ill if we adopted the defects of the English honor schools in the doubtful project of attaining their virtues. Any reform of our elective system must leave untouched the status of advanced scientific instruction, or, if possible, better it.

The problem is the most difficult and delicate one of striking a balance between tutorial and professorial instruction. Already there is a tendency in America to revert to personal teaching. In many of the larger courses it is impossible to obtain good results without conferences between teacher and taught. If the system of conferences could be extended the problem of the honor schools would be solved. It would be no longer necessary to rely on the lecture courses for police duty; and the wise guidance of a tutor would in some measure remove the necessity of the recurrent police examinations. Thus the student would be able to elect such courses only with the professors of the university as the competent adviser might judge it best for him to take; and if the faculty were relieved of the labor of unnecessary instruction and examination it would be possible, without greater expense than at present, to offer a well-considered honor examination, and to provide that the examination books should be graded with something more than clerical intelligence.

It would by no means be necessary to make the honor examination, as at Oxford, the only basis for granting the honor degree. The lecture courses found available by the student would be those in which the instruction is most advanced, the university courses, properly speaking; and his examinations in these would be a criterion—such as Oxford is very much in need of—for correcting the evidence of the honor exami-

nation. Furthermore, in connection with one or more of these courses, it would be easy for the student to prepare an honor thesis studied from the original sources, under the constant advice of a university professor. Such a scheme might combine in any desired proportion the merits of the English honor schools with those of American advanced instruction.

As to the details of the new system experience would be the final teacher; but for a first experiment the English arrangement is in its main outline suggestive. An American pass degree, as distinguished from the more difficult honor degree, might be taken by electing, as all students now elect, a certain number of courses at random. For the increasing number of those who can afford three years' study only, such a degree would probably prove of the greatest advantage. For the honor men, two general examinations, such as the English "Moderations" and "Finals," would probably suffice. For his second-year honor examination, Moderations, a student might select from three or four general groups. This examination would offer just that opportunity for mental culture the lack of which Dean Briggs laments. Furthermore, it would be easy to arrange the second year's honor group so as to include such studies only as are serviceable both for the purposes of a general education and in leading to the studies the student is likely to elect for final honors. For the final examination the student might choose from a dozen or more honor groups, in any one of which he would receive scientific culture of the most advanced type; while by means of private reading under his tutor he might fill in very pleasantly the outlines of his subject.

It is probable that such a system would even facilitate the efforts of those who are endeavoring to transplant German standards. According to Professor Münsterberg, the student who specializes in the German university is a good two years or more in advance of the American freshman. The spirit of German instruction would thus require that the period of general culture be extended at least to the middle of the undergraduate course. Such a plan, and I fear such a plan only, would enable an undergraduate to choose what he wants and pursue it with a fair chance of success. It would make the elective system elective.

In his "Old-Fashioned Doubts," Dean Briggs has advocated a similar reform, though he apparently does not aim at quite as much freedom:

"I still doubt whether we can do better for our children than, first, [in the preparatory school] to drill them in a few subjects, mostly old ones; then to give them a modest general education in college, or in all but the last year or two of college; then to let them specialize as energetically as they can, but not exclusively."

JOHN CORBIN.

RELIGIOUS JOURNALISM IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA.

THE essential disadvantages of religious journalism are akin to those attributed to amphibious animals in the school-boy's definition, "creatures that can't live on the land and die in the water." It is not really at home either in the church or in the world. In ecclesiastical circles it is seldom that the editor of a religious paper is thought of as exerting an influence equal to that of the occupant of a leading pulpit, or that his work receives such sympathy and coöperation as are given to a missionary society. On the other hand, a journal of this type, though duly entered in a press directory, differs as widely from an average newspaper in its aims, its methods, and its limitations as a ministers' social union from a club of literary Bohemians. To his clerical brethren the editor of a church paper seems scarcely more than a layman, while secular journalists regard him as very much of an amateur. The fact is that his task demands a rare combination of spiritual fervor and professional skill. He must be in close touch with the most significant religious forces of his time, and must also possess a high development of the journalistic instinct. It has been said that if St. Paul returned to the world to-day, he would become the editor of a religious paper. If so, he would find ample scope for exercising the tact by which he "became all things to all men," and would soon have a new set of perils to add to those which he enumerated in writing to the Corinthians.

Just now there are indications of an awakening to the opportunity of religious journalism in America, together with a conviction that this opportunity will be missed unless there is a considerable modification of traditional methods. During a recent visit to England, Dr. A. E. Dunning, editor-in-chief of the Boston "Congregationalist," frankly told a representative of the London "Examiner" that the American religious journalism of even fifteen years ago was dead or dying. He described certain changes in the taste of readers which must be recognized by the religious newspaper "if it is to exist at all." In particular, he declared that, in his opinion, "the day of the strictly religious paper which excludes so-called 'secular' writing has almost ended." In view of the

near approach of this transition period, it may be of interest to institute a comparison with the religious journalism of England, which has got through its transitions in a series of small instalments, and now appears, on the whole, fairly stable and prosperous. In this article the word "journalism" will be interpreted as including periodical literature generally — quarterlies and monthlies as well as weeklies. The question of religious dailies, although none exists, would demand a separate article.

The problems and conditions of denominational journalism are nearly identical in the two countries. A periodical which is attached to one particular church has obviously a narrower field than any other kind of religious publication. Its possible constituency is necessarily smaller, and it has to depend for contributions mainly upon writers who are willing, from denominational loyalty, to accept less than the market rate of remuneration. It is certain to suffer from the growing tendency to make less of denominational distinctions, the tendency, as Henry Ward Beecher put it, to regard such differences as lines instead of walls. Its subscribers do not understand its limitations, and are consequently too exigent in their demands. They compare it, most unfairly, with the productions of wealthy publishing houses, which can afford to risk a large outlay, and are bound by no doctrinal or ecclesiastical restrictions. If it is official, its editor has to act under the instructions of a committee, which in its turn is controlled by a conference or other assembly: in such conditions it is hopeless to expect any vigor of initiative in its policy. If it is a private venture, it is exposed to the danger of creating or stimulating party feeling within the church, and thus loosening the very ties which it is intended to strengthen.

Yet the denominational periodical, whatever may be its future, has made in the past a valuable contribution to popular education. Long before the establishment of the great firms which have won a reputation for supplying cheap literature for the masses, there were many obscure villages in England — and doubtless many scattered townships in America — where the arrival of the itinerant preacher was eagerly awaited on account of the magazines in his saddle-bag scarcely less than for the sake of his own sermons. These publications, too, have not only given an intellectual stimulus to readers, but have also done good service in training writers. In many cases they have afforded opportunities of literary experience to contributors who have afterward won distinction beyond the boundaries of their own church.

In England, the denominational quarterlies that still exist are excellent in quality, but so few in number and so small in circulation and in-

fluence that it needs an effort to remember them when one is thinking about religious journalism. The monthlies are more important, but are not very prominent in the public eye. They contain some of the best religious writing that is to be found anywhere, but it does not seem to reach very far. Writing for such publications affords something of the sensation of preaching in a half-empty church. There is reason to believe that purchasers allow their names to go on the subscription list rather to oblige the pastor or to benefit the church funds than from any hope of either edification or delight from the study of the magazine itself. The modern practice of cutting edges before publication has debarred the curious investigator from the use of one test which was formerly wont to yield discouraging revelations.

Of late years there have been evident indications of a growing tendency for denominational monthlies to be less distinctive than they used to be. You cannot put much Methodism or Presbyterianism into a description of the life history of the white ant, or an account of mountaineering in the Andes, or a criticism of the style of George Meredith, or an engraving of a picture in the Royal Academy. Still less can you express by these media the divergences between Wesleyan Methodism and Primitive Methodism. The success of the new policy is doubtful. The denominational magazine thus made undenominational wins no new subscribers from outside, for it cannot compete with the productions of the private publishing firms; at the same time it perplexes and disturbs its most attached readers within the church, who miss the features of denominational interest to which they have become accustomed. It is well to have a broad outlook; but the church organ which gives no indication of its affiliation except on the title-page has lost its *raison d'être*.

The English denominational weeklies, which are much more influential than the monthlies, are seldom officially connected with the churches they represent. One of the few exceptions is "The Presbyterian," which requires an annual subsidy of \$1,250 from the Synod to keep it afloat. At every Methodist Ecumenical Conference the English delegates are surprised to find that the American Methodist weeklies are official, and the American delegates express equal astonishment at the absence of ecclesiastical control from the weeklies of English Methodism. The question will, no doubt, be discussed again next September, and each side will remain of its own opinion still. In spite of the fact that some of the most serious crises in the history of English Methodism have been connected with the freedom of independent newspapers, this freedom is considered to have been an advantage on the whole. It has certainly been of great

service in preparing the way for reforms which would not otherwise have been accomplished without strife.

It is scarcely necessary to say that all the weekly papers within the Anglican Church are unofficial. Of the many organs representing the various parties in that church, "The Guardian" has the most distinguished record. For years it excelled any of the professedly literary papers in its reviews of general literature. The recent announcement of a volume of articles collected from the contributions of Walter Pater to this journal gives some indication of its width of range. For its foreign news, "The Guardian" has not depended, like the other religious weeklies, upon the material provided by the daily press, but has maintained correspondents of its own in the European capitals. It was published at sixpence until a few years ago, when its price was reduced to threepence. Almost all the other religious weeklies in England, whether denominational or undenominational, are published at a penny. Owing to a disagreement with the proprietors respecting the ritual controversy, the editor of "The Guardian," Mr. Lathbury, recently resigned, and founded a paper of similar type, "The Pilot," at the old price of sixpence. Some of the penny papers within the Anglican Church have large circulations and considerable influence; but their topics are more exclusively ecclesiastical than those of the journals just named. Indeed, if current controversies were settled the occupation of some of them would be gone. The comments of Maurice, Robertson, and Kingsley on the Church of England journalism of their own day will be remembered in this connection.

It is when we turn to magazines and newspapers prepared for the religious public in general, and not for the adherents of a particular denomination, that a contrast is most evident between English and American methods. There does not appear to be anything on this side of the Atlantic corresponding to such sixpenny illustrated monthly magazines as "Good Words," "The Sunday Magazine," "The Sunday at Home," and "The Quiver." These periodicals are of long standing, and are widely read both by Established Churchmen and by Nonconformists. They avoid questions of ecclesiastical and doctrinal controversy, having been established to supply, for religious households, Sunday reading in harmony with the devotional spirit of the day. They do not abjure fiction or papers on science and travel, but they are entirely free from sensationalism, and breathe a restful, Sabbath atmosphere. They number among their contributors some of the leading writers and artists. More varied in contents, but no less religious in tone, are such popular monthlies as "The Leisure Hour" and "The Young Man." It appears especially surprising

that the latter periodical, a vigorous threepenny magazine, has no counterpart in America.

There is another class of monthly religious magazines which has a large circulation, especially in the provinces. I refer to the penny and halfpenny periodicals, of which "The British Workman" and "The Cottager and Artisan" may be taken as types. They are widely distributed through the literature secretaries of Sunday-schools, and the engravings they publish may be seen adorning the walls of many a workingman's home in town and country. I use the word "adorning" advisedly, in spite of the contempt recently expressed by a New York editor for the taste of "the peasantry of the British Empire"; for, although they lay no claim to literary merit, these periodicals generally deserve high commendation for the quality of their printing and artistic production.

Near akin are the localized magazines, which are now a highly appreciated feature of church work in all parts of the kingdom. The localized magazine is an illustrated monthly publication of sixteen pages. Its London publisher supplies it in sheets four weeks in advance to individual churches, of whatever denomination, at the rate of about a dollar a hundred copies. The pastor or magazine agent of the church adds a wrapper, containing advertisements and church notices, printed locally. The complete magazine is then sold at a penny a copy, and the profits from advertisements and sales aid the funds of the church. It is often found practicable to sell a considerable number of copies, and then to distribute others as an announcement of the church's activities. The Carr's Lane Congregational Church, at Birmingham, of which Dr. R. W. Dale was pastor, takes no less than 4,000 copies a month of one of these magazines. The system is even more widely adopted in the Church of England than among Nonconformists. In small towns, three or four churches of various denominations often combine to issue a localized magazine, especially where a Free Church Council has been formed. Owing to the large circulation of the inside sheet, its publishers can afford to secure the help of leading writers. For instance, in taking up the programme of one of these magazines at random, I find an announcement of a serial story by Adeline Sergeant, and of contributions by Sir Walter Besant, "Ian Maclaren," Dr. R. F. Horton, Rev. F. B. Meyer, etc.

But the strongest and most influential section of religious journalism in England is undoubtedly that which consists of the independent and undenominational weeklies. Some of them have large circulations, pay their proprietors handsome profits, and do much to form the political as well as the religious opinions of their readers. Let us take, as a speci-

men, "The Christian World." In general appearance it bears considerable resemblance to "The New York Times Saturday Review." Its columns are of the same width as those of the latter paper, but they are slightly longer, and there are five of them to a page instead of four. An average number consists of twenty-four pages. In the last number received up to the time of writing, I find over nine pages of advertisements. As these advertisements are paid for at rates varying from twelve cents a column-line to more than seven dollars a column-inch, according to position, it is evident that the proprietors need no subsidy, in spite of the cost of the literary matter. The paper includes Wednesday news from all parts of the country, including reference to Parliamentary debates on Wednesday nights; but it is delivered with the London daily papers of Thursday morning, and can be obtained during that day, for the sum of a penny, at almost every railway bookstall or news-agent's shop in the kingdom.

"The Christian World" contains a variety of articles on religious, social, and literary topics; but its most distinctive feature as compared with American religious papers is the completeness of its news of the events of the week in all the churches. To illustrate again from the current number, I find thirteen columns of news paragraphs from ten different denominations, in addition to Christian Endeavor, Y. M. C. A., and other undenominational organizations. There are also reports, varying from a column and a quarter to four columns, of the National Christian Endeavor Convention at Sheffield, the Welsh Calvinistic Methodist General Assembly at Aberystwyth, the "New Century" Unitarian Meetings in London, the Friends' Yearly Meeting, also in London, and the Annual Assemblies of the Established Church of Scotland and the United Free Church in Edinburgh. The prevailing tone of the paper is Congregationalist, but it is accepted without demur as representing the Free Churches generally. Its theology, however, is rather broader than that of the average Nonconformist minister or member. "The Christian World" was founded in 1857, and came in 1860 into the hands of the late Mr. James Clarke, who turned it from a struggling sheet into a successful paper. It has descended to his sons, who now control both the editorial and the publishing departments.

A younger religious paper, but one which has gained a strong position, is "The British Weekly," founded in 1886 by the co-operation of Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll and Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton. This journal also gives full accounts of what is being done in all the churches; but its predominating flavor is Presbyterian. It publishes a special Scotch edition,

and has done much to introduce the leading Scotch preachers and theologians to the English public. It has made from the beginning a special feature of literary news and criticism, and can claim the credit of having "discovered," or at any rate of having encouraged early in their career, J. M. Barrie, "Ian Maclaren," Jane Barlow, and other well-known writers. One of its most attractive features is the admirable descriptive reporting by "Lorna," a Scotch lady journalist, who also edits the "Woman's World" column, writes brilliant interviews, and, there is reason to believe, acted as "The British Weekly's" military critic during the first few months of the Transvaal War. Another paper deserving special mention is "The Christian," which holds a place of its own as supplying the fullest record obtainable of the missionary and philanthropic activities, at home and abroad, of both the evangelical section of the Church of England and the Nonconformists.

Besides these there are several penny religious papers of a "Tit-Bits" type. In some cases they have a large circulation, but they carry no weight. Two or three of them have a certain connection with this country, inasmuch as they depend on American anecdotes and Dr. Talmage's sermons for a considerable proportion of their "copy." This outline of the undenominational religious press may conclude with a brief reference to such sectional papers as the organs of the Sunday-school, the Christian Endeavor movement, etc. In quality, influence, and circulation the American papers of this class are far ahead of those published in England. In particular, there is nothing in England to be set beside "The Sunday School Times" of Philadelphia.

A study of the history and tendencies of religious journalism suggests certain general reflections. In the first place, the religious paper, however its methods may be modified, is a permanent form of journalism; it is here to stay. The secular paper may pay increased attention to news of the churches; but, even though it should ultimately publish a weekly religious supplement — some day a newspaper proprietor will open his eyes and discover that there are as many people interested in religion as in literature — it can never make the definitely and aggressively religious organ unnecessary. For it is not a mere matter of news, but a question of tone and of standpoint. The problem cannot be solved by distributing a sufficient corps of smart reporters among a sufficient number of synods and conferences. As Dr. Dunning puts it in the interview previously mentioned: "The great interests of the church, ethical, sociological, educational, and missionary have become essential elements of national life." These cannot be understood except by men who have given them careful

study. There is further the difficulty of diversities of creeds. It is impossible for any one paper to meet the needs of even the leading denominations represented in this country. It might allot a certain space to each for its own ecclesiastical intelligence; but — however interesting a study so catholic a paper would be — it could not by any means present in one sheet even a discussion of the events of the day from the divergent standpoints of these various churches. Still less could it deal adequately with theological problems, or supply devotional reading that would be acceptable in all quarters. The necessary neutrality of a secular paper would involve insipidity also.

There is no reason, however, why there should not be a further grouping of literary effort among churches that are nearly allied. At any rate, the churches that in England are federated in the Free Church Council — the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Quakers — have enough in common to make such a union possible. The vast distances in this country will always prevent any Eastern weekly paper from circulating all over the United States to the same degree that a London paper circulates all over the United Kingdom. For that very reason it seems especially desirable that in various localities there should be arranged such combinations as I have just suggested. If at Chicago, for example, there were published one strong, well-endowed, and well-equipped religious weekly representing these various churches in the Middle West in the same way that "The Christian World" represents the Nonconformists of England, would it not exert a far stronger force in the promotion of righteousness than is at present exercised by all the religious papers of that city put together? It appears strange that while denominational differences are less acute in America than in England, as is shown by the facility with which a minister can travel from one church to another and then back again, a position of isolation should be so strongly cherished in literary enterprise. The recent advance of the Boston "Congregationalist" in publishing once a month a special number containing reports of the progress of other denominations is an encouraging sign of the times; but the admiring comment with which so hazardous an innovation has been received indicates the urgent need for it.

Another reason besides the tendency to interdenominational union will make it more and more difficult for a successful religious paper to be the official organ of any particular church. One of the most important functions of a journal of this kind is to lead the opinion of church members on such public questions as involve considerations of morality. But on several of the most urgent of these problems there is by no means

unanimity of sentiment within any particular church; and it is consequently impossible for any editor who is directly responsible to an ecclesiastical body, and whose paper is assisted by a subvention from that body, to be as outspoken and independent as the case demands. It is easy to enunciate general principles that everybody agrees with; but when it comes to their application the official editor is beset by a dilemma. The utmost he can say is, for instance, that if such-and-such a method of acquiring wealth is immoral, it ought to be condemned; whereas what the reader wants is some help in judging whether the hypothesis is a fact. No paper, whether religious or secular, can hold a position of permanent influence if its editor is always sitting on the fence.

The growing importance of these larger national questions will gradually overshadow interests of merely sectional or denominational significance. Hence there is a great future for such papers as "The Outlook" and "The Independent," which deal with big subjects from a religious point of view, and devote scarcely any space to the details of church work. But there seems to be room also for papers of "The Christian World" and "The British Weekly" type — papers, that is to say, which while discussing political and social problems and admitting lighter magazine features will also furnish an adequate chronicle of the more important events in the religious world. There are certain minutiae which will tend to disappear, such as reports of bazaars, farewell presentations, church socials, and other items of no more than local value. Journalism has been defined as "the art of lending to people and events intrinsically dull an interest which does not properly belong to them"; but even an expert would be baffled by the task of adding a charm to some of the utterly insignificant paragraphs that pour in upon the desk of the editor of a church paper. There are movements and incidents, however, that repay full and careful treatment, and that cannot obtain the attention they deserve unless some religious journalist is willing to take pains about them.

Perhaps the most effective reform in the religious newspapers of the future will be a lowering in price. A paper of high quality appearing at the democratic figure of two cents would reach a large constituency that cannot afford the aristocratic ten cents, or even the reduced subscription price which has to be paid in one sum. By readers whose income is moderate two cents a week can be paid much more easily than a dollar a year. Accordingly, the paper which is to gain a large circulation among the multitude must be procurable at the railway book stall or at the news-agent's store as easily as through the mail. Supply

and demand must stimulate each other until this stage has been reached. The importance of competent and enterprising business management is often overlooked in the discussion of this question; but it is as necessary to religious as to secular journalism. Where publisher and editor are alike efficient, the recommendations of readers will do more to extend the circulation than will be done by a lavish expenditure on advertising. The one thing that never induces people to subscribe to a religious paper is any attempt at coercion. If they like the paper they will buy it and read it, but they cannot be lectured into taking it.

To workers who need public applause to give a relish to their labors, and who cannot be content with any service which does not bring their own names into prominence and honor, religious journalism has few attractions to offer. After years of earnest effort, the religious editor, whatever place he may visit, will share the depressing experience of the editor of "The Eatanswill Independent" when he alighted wet and weary at Towcester. No enthusiastic crowds press forward to greet him; the church bells are silent; his very name elicits no responsive feeling in the torpid bosoms of the people. But, with all respect to Mr. Slurk, such a reception is not enough to curdle the ink in one's pen, if one's task is undertaken in a healthy spirit. It is true that a little encouragement now and then heartens and cheers; but the greatness of the work is itself a compensation for much that is disagreeable and depressing. When that is once understood, is it not as pleasant to labor in the shade as in the glare?

HERBERT W. HORWILL.

CERTAIN FAILURES IN SCHOOL HYGIENE.

IT was my pleasant privilege to visit, quite recently, schools in nineteen towns, located in six States, spending in some cases several days or even weeks in observing a single school. I was received most courteously, even cordially, and both time and pains were taken to enable me to study the work. Under these circumstances I naturally hesitate to comment upon certain unfortunate features; and if I had not considered myself but a pedagogical tramp, picking up here and there whatever was found to be worth devouring, I should look upon myself in the light of a well-entertained guest who, at his departure, turns around and criticises his host. Disraeli declared it "more easy to be critical than correct." It is, perhaps, still easier to pick out the flaws in a well-regulated system; and, were it not for the fact that certain unhygienic incidents that I met with are probably typical, I should keep my silence.

The increasing importance attached to applied pedagogy and child-study, the sympathy and self-repression of the teacher, and the intense interest taken not only in the subjects taught but also in the pupils have been noticed with great pleasure. It is owing, perhaps, to these successful features in the schools of to-day that an outsider sees certain phases overlooked at times by those in charge.

As an illustration: In one of the most enviable school systems — in a city in New Jersey — it is the custom to eliminate the morning recess. The local school law on this matter states: "There shall be no out-door recess in any room above the second-year class." The following reasons were given for thus abolishing one of the most important features of school life, from both a hygienic and a social point of view: (1) When the children go out-doors they do not all put on their wraps, and so are apt to catch cold; (2) outdoor recess is unnecessary, as a five-minute recess is taken, during the morning session, in some of the rooms; (3) gymnastics take the place of the exercise the children would receive out-doors. Unfortunately gymnastics do take the place of the recesses. But of what do they consist? In the schools of the city under con-

sideration I watched the gymnastic exercises in three buildings; but in none other of all the exercises in the schools did I see such close attention demanded, and needed, as in these gymnastics. In fact, the object of these non-voluntary exercises seemed to be the formation of habits of constant and close attention, immediate action, and rapidity of obedience. Many of the commands were given so rapidly as to strain the attention, lest the orders should be misunderstood and responded to by the wrong execution. This naturally causes an undue strain on nerves already fatigued by study. Afterward, as is often the case, the pupils were required to march and countermarch about the room until a sufficient amount of dust had been raised to enable them to take their singing lesson in comfort.

In two buildings I saw some very interesting bean-bag exercises. In one case the exercise was being tried in one of the large corridors, a most excellent plan; but the principal said, apologetically, that it was "an experiment." Unfortunately owing to lack of time and space some of the children were barred out of these exercises. It is also the custom in that city to prolong the morning session one hour on rainy days, and to omit the afternoon session. One of the teachers declared that this extra period was an agony both to pupils and teachers, and, as far as lessons were concerned, was absolutely useless.

On another occasion I visited several schools in another city, whose school system is of national, or even international, reputation. At one of these schools I was again told that the recess had been transferred to the close of the morning session. This may have accounted in part for the unusual amount of conversation indulged in by the pupils in one room, especially by those farthest away from the teacher, and also for the disorder in another room, where the open defiance shown to the teacher was the worst that I have ever seen in any school. In the second building I do not recall any recess; and in the third, where the order was much better, there was an intermission during which the pupils were lined up and then marched down to the basement. For this recess each room in turn was allowed five minutes.

It must be admitted that these are single instances. Yet is not the tendency to abolish the recess growing stronger among the teachers in this country? It was only a short time ago that a superintendent in one of the largest New England cities suggested in his annual report the abandonment of the afternoon recess. In school reports just received from two Southern cities, it is stated that the school sessions are from 9 A.M. to 2 P.M. In one city there is given on each school day a twenty

minutes' recess, and in the other, whose system has been granted a coveted exhibition diploma, fifteen minutes daily are allowed for "general recess or physical exercise." Unfortunately, the question of fatigue has not received so much attention in this country as in Germany. As a result, the American teacher, who is, of course, anxious to get out of the school-room as soon as possible, and also to avoid the "confusion" incident to recesses, is slowly bringing about the abandonment of intermissions; whereas in Germany there is a legal requirement demanding forty minutes of intermission, exclusive of gymnastics, for every five hours of school work.

The need of ventilation is one important reason for frequent recesses. Although the ventilating systems in use in most of the schools of to-day are considered, by their manufacturers, almost perfect, yet in many rooms visited the air was not pure, and the temperature was either too high or too low, generally too high. In some cases the temperature was so high and the fresh air so scanty that pupils fainted, and teachers admitted that they felt faint. It is an axiom of hygiene that a well-regulated nose and a well-clothed body are in health among the best testers of foul air and extreme temperature; and yet even these gauges, though always at hand, are neglected. But, however perfect the heating system may be, there is certainly an advantage in opening the windows, from time to time, for a minute or two, for the purpose of letting in fresh air and permitting the foul air to escape. It does not even need Dr. Dankwarth's experiments to corroborate this statement. The thermometer itself is an inaccurate indicator of the temperature of the school-room, when one thermometer only is used, and when that is hung not in the open, and at a level with the children's heads, but, as is generally the case, against the wall, at a place and a height where the children never are.

Again, even with the best heating apparatus the air is generally dry and dusty. Kotelmann, in his "School Hygiene," says:

"If dust has settled on the heating surface of the furnace, or if dust-laden air comes in contact with it, the dust particles are scorched, and burnt products are produced which irritate the mucous membranes of the throat and eyes."

The child is exposed to this danger, not only from heating and overheating, and from dust raised by marching and stamping over the school-room floor, but also from the chalk-dust. In one school-room it was the practice of the teacher to have several pupils erase all the chalk marks from the board just before dismissal. These children certainly had something to take home from school in their little heads. I was recently in another room where each member of the class in algebra was sent to the

board to work out examples. As the space on the board was limited, the pupils were crowded, which, to be sure, gave them an advantage in copying their neighbor's examples; but it also had the disadvantage of enveloping them in clouds of dust, since, at the completion of each example, there was a simultaneous rapid erasure by the pupils at the board.

Probably no book on the general subject of school hygiene has been published from the days of Horace Mann to the present time that does not include at least a reference to the position of the pupil at his desk. Indeed, even Locke hinted at this when he wrote that the pupil "should learn how to lay his Paper, and place his Arm and Body to it." One of the blessings promised by those who introduced the vertical system of penmanship was a correction of the crooked-back position of the pupils, since they must sit correctly in order to write the script correctly. The vertical system, if properly used, does possess this merit as long as the child is engaged in the writing exercise; but its influence amounts to little beyond this. Although I visited scores of school-rooms of all grades, in country and city, yet, so far as I can recall, the position of the pupil while writing was apparently unnoticed by any teacher, at any time, in any room, except during the few minutes set apart for "penmanship." This is all the more painful when we consider that writing as a distinct exercise occupies only a few minutes each day, while one-fifth to one-half of the time spent by the pupil in the school building is occupied by written work. Indeed, the spelling of the motto of the school-room of to-day seems to have been slightly changed until it reads: "Always do write."

The undue amount of time given to this work may be more or less pedagogical; but it is most certainly unhygienic, for not only are the muscles of the trunk and arms involved in an incorrect position at the desk, for the greater part of the time, but the injury to the eyes from too close attention to the script and from the careful following of the pen and pencil points would seem to be incalculable. Incorrect posture insidiously tends to induce spinal curvature and diseases of the internal organs. Eulenbergs has declared that 90 per cent of curvatures of the spine not caused by actual bone disease are developed during school life; and Cohn and other oculists have shown that the most serious cases of near-sightedness increase in direct proportion to the advance in school grades. Whether or not these views are correct, it is, nevertheless, of the utmost importance that these investigations should be considered.

I was unpleasantly surprised to notice a comparatively new evil in school hygiene, one that I am afraid has come to stay. I refer to the

mimeograph, the hectograph, and kindred graphic devices, which, if improperly used, turn out copies which cannot fail to endanger the eyes. I have seldom seen a machine so perfectly manipulated in the school-room as to give a clear copy on every sheet handed out to the pupils. Quite recently I happened to be in a school-room where the teacher of geography was reading over the questions or syllabus she had prepared, because the hectograph copies she had distributed were too faint to be read.

Probably too little attention is given by the teacher to the general health of her pupils, and it is not surprising if she has not been taught to look for the evils that may arise. In a school-room in New Jersey I noted within a few minutes one child with some throat trouble, one with an eye disease, and a third with disease, apparently, in both throat and nose, possibly due to catarrh. There was no indication on the part of the teacher that she noticed these disabilities; and I was still further surprised when I learned, a few weeks later, that this same teacher had been appointed to the principalship of a new school just opened in the city. I have one delightful recollection of a teacher in a Vermont school who made one of her pupils who was slightly deaf change her seat so that she might more easily hear a story I was to tell.

I shall not ask "What is the cause that the former days were better than these?" for I admit that, all things considered, the present days are the better. I have a decided impression, however, that more training was formerly given to the voice of the child than is given to-day. Voice culture certainly holds but a small place in the curricula of the lower schools at the present time. This is evident from the thickness of speech, the careless enunciation, and the dropping of final letters, all resulting in a general indistinctness. This should be classed among hygienic evils; because, to a certain extent, the character of the phonation indicates the condition of the health of the vocal organs. The singing exercise may also be responsible for injured vocal organs, for in singing the condition of the individual voice is rarely taken into consideration. In one school—a model school, too—where the music to be sung by the children was refreshingly delightful in its beauty and artistic taste, the range of the selections to be learned was too great. I admit that the pupils were divided into two sections, since they were learning a two-part song; and yet, as is usually the case, they were divided not according to voices, but according to the arrangement of the seats. A still worse evil may be daily noticed in almost all high schools and upper-grade rooms where the pupils attempt to sing, often *fortis-*

simo, apparently without the teacher's knowing the important fact that the voice is a wonderfully delicate organ, when it is changing, and that at this time it can be most easily injured for life. Some throat specialists go so far as to say that a boy should never sing while his voice is changing. It may be true that ninety per cent of Americans are troubled with catarrh; but if this catarrhal tendency were checked in the child, and due regard were paid by the teacher to the voice and the voice-producing organs, the rate of this disease would probably be checked.

Is the teacher supposed to be also a physician? Certainly not; yet every teacher should have a sure and practical knowledge of many of the essential features of school hygiene, including both mental and physical pathology. At a recent meeting of the New York Academy of Medicine, Prof. Lightner Witmer, of the University of Pennsylvania, declared that the teacher was more favorably situated than the physician for detecting mental deficiency. That Prof. Witmer closely associated mental with physical deficiency was shown by his statement that he had never met with a case of chronic bad spelling in which he had not also found some visual defect. The knowledge on the part of the teacher, in this regard, need be no more than is necessary to enable her to detect, by simple tests where necessary, defects in seeing, hearing, talking, dentition, posture, and general health. When actual defects are discovered, the parents should be consulted, and the necessity of a physician's attention should be shown to them. Is it unfair to expect the teacher to have this training when she is supposed to have the general oversight of the child? And if the teacher is lacking in a knowledge of the elements of school hygiene, should we not place a part of the blame on the institutions that train her?

I recently spent a month in foraging around in a well-known New England normal school. While there, I neither heard nor heard of any instruction given on school hygiene. Moreover, in the model school there was no artificial ventilation, and some of the rooms were heated, generally overheated, by means of unjacketed stoves. The vivacious, energetic critic teacher, who confessed to me that she almost fell asleep in one of the rooms, mentioned the matter of overheating to one of her classes — the only recollection I have of any mention by her or any one else in the school on the subject of school hygiene. In addition to these and other hygienic evils at this model school, the closets were in a filthy condition, and there was no indication that they had ever been disinfected.

Although woman naturally represents the conservative side of humanity, yet the professionally trained teacher is generally willing and

eager to be progressive in any line that she considers will be for her advantage and for that of her pupils. It is not to be wondered at that, with her multiplicity of duties, the teacher should fail to notice that her pupils have not removed their rubbers, laying the foundation for corns and chilblains in plenty; that some of the books the children are using are filthy, and never were, and never will be, disinfected; that, while she is trying to explain a problem in arithmetic the little backs and shoulders and arms of her pupils are unnaturally twisted and bent; and that a dozen other facts are working to the perpetual discomfort, if not actual detriment, of those for whom she is responsible. I have not spoken of the teacher's recognized enemy, the janitor, the autocrat of the school-house, the man who neglects his work, and who holds his position because he has a vote — sometimes flexible — and a political pull, the man who, with a broom, and a duster, most aptly named, sends the microbes sailing once more.

In the catalogues of fifty normal schools, in twenty-nine States, there is not to be found a single indication of a distinct course in school hygiene, although in one catalogue it is said that "the greater part of the time [of a course in school management] will be devoted to the subject of school hygiene in its relation to the different phases of school management." Also in one other school it is fortunately included "for the shaping of the school conformably to the laws of the child's physical nature." In a third school "school hygiene" is mentioned as the last division, and, judging from the full outline of "physiology and hygiene," one of the least important. And in two other schools of these fifty the subject is mentioned to the extent that in each case a book on the subject is expected to be read. There are perhaps schools where the subject exists by itself, and probably among these fifty it is taught in connection with "physiology and hygiene," or it may be hidden away under "school management."

School hygiene is now recognized as a subject by itself: and thanks to Dr. Burnham, of Clark University, and other scientists, the public is becoming interested in it, and the normal schools are beginning to give it the place it demands. The fifty normal schools referred to were selected at random, and a few of the catalogues were a year old. I know of two schools not included in the fifty which have recently admitted the subject to their curricula; and were I permitted to lapse into prophecy, I should declare that ten years from now the professionally-trained teacher who is not acquainted with the principles of this subject will not be considered worthy of recognition.

R. CLARK.

A PLEA FOR ARCHITECTURAL STUDIES.

THE century which has recently closed was preëminent for its marvellous widening of man's intellectual horizons and for its summoning of the multitude to share in this beneficent enlargement of the human outlook. The summits of learning are no longer walled about by insurmountable barriers; and even those who cannot scale these loftier peaks may yet climb the lower heights and look out upon a wider and fairer world than spreads itself to their view from below. The multiplication of books has made them the possession of the many: and to minds gifted with imagination the printed page reveals a new world almost as actual as that in which our outer lives are passed. While to the traveller history and art become familiar and vital in the material presence of the monuments of other days, to the stay-at-home the text-book of history can make the past live again, while the photograph and lantern-slide bring to his eyes the storied relics of antiquity and the artistic treasures of other continents.

It is by no mere chance that the fine arts have come to share in this popular intellectual awakening. Our people are not devoid of artistic impulses; but until lately they have been too absorbed in their vast industrial activities and the solution of the grave political and social problems of their destiny to give much thought to the finer amenities of life. Only in recent years have they begun to discover the extent of their artistic destitution and to realize the immaturity of many features of the national life. This consciousness, once awakened, has aroused a new interest in artistic and historical studies. It is the thirsty who travel far to seek the fountain. Yet with all the progress of the last quarter of a century, it is surprising to note how often people of fair education think of art as a wholly extraneous thing, having about as much to do with every-day life and its concerns as esoteric Buddhism or the theology of the Greek poets. It may be for them an entertaining and perhaps profitable study, but it is still an outside concern which it is quite permissible to ignore.

People who entertain such ideas as these have had for the most part

no opportunity to learn what art really is. They have seldom seen a beautiful building, or looked upon a fine picture, or stood before a noble statue. Their lives and surroundings have been barren of beauty. Through lack of occasion for exercise, and by reason of mental preoccupation with practical, social, religious, political, and other interests, their aesthetic sensibilities have become atrophied. These lie dormant, but they can be awakened. Give sufficient contact and communion with beautiful things, and these aesthetic capacities spring into life like flowers in the sun. At their first emergence they are crude and undeveloped, like all new-born things. They need for their growth the enlightenment of correct information and the stimulus of acquaintance with the masterpieces.

Correct information is easily supplied: manuals treating of the history and general principles of the arts were never so abundant and cheap as to-day. Acquaintance with the masterpieces is also possible to some extent for every one, not, it is true, that intimate acquaintance which comes only from long and familiar communion with the great works themselves, but acquaintance, nevertheless, of a valuable and inspiring sort, through the medium of photographs, casts, engravings, and that nineteenth-century miracle the stereopticon, which places before the eye in vivid relief the luminous image of the object, in an aspect only less real than the reality itself. And the acquisition of such information is not only demanded by those whose ignorance of art is profound and whose tastes are unawakened. The large and ever-growing ranks of those who have already mastered the rudiments, at least, of the knowledge of art in general, or of particular phases of the arts, call for further draughts at the fountain from which they have already drunk so refreshingly. For those whose minds are alert and whose artistic enthusiasm has already been kindled, these multiplied sources of information are even more profitable than for those to whom only the first pages of the history and principles of art have as yet been opened.

The training of the taste thus awakened is a less simple thing than its awakening. Good taste cannot be imparted like a science; for taste is not a matter of formulæ, and the principles of art elude definition and rigid statement. Facts, however, can be stated with precision; and the facts of the history of art, and especially of architecture, are not only full of interest, but also full of instruction. Moreover, the history of architecture, as of art in general, has to do not only with facts, but also with the relations between them. These relations are, in a measure, matters of personal opinion, of speculation, or of inference. They are,

for this reason, amenable to the test of the reader's own judgment. The facts he must, perforce, take on trust; but the inferences and conclusions from them he is free, and often perfectly competent, to weigh in the balance of his own reasoning.

In the case of the history of architecture, these facts derive additional importance from their connection with, and bearing upon, the great movements of life and thought which preceded and accompanied them. The study of the chronicles of building in any period must involve also the study of the political movements and social conditions of the times under review, or it will fail utterly of its purpose. The history, I had almost said the biography, of every great architectural masterpiece is, as it were, saturated with the aroma of historical and romantic associations. Indeed, there can hardly be a more delightful way of studying the history of civilization than to make it centre about the development and progress of the art of building.

The reader is free, as I have said, to pass his own judgments upon the inferences and conclusions which an author draws from the facts he presents. He is no less free to pass under review the criticisms which he encounters in his reading. There is no absolute standard by which to measure artistic merit. *Æsthetic* criticism must necessarily be subjective and personal. There are, of course, certain verdicts which the ages have registered, and which even the most daring critic can hardly call in question. Apart from these the critic's own judgments are simply the records of impressions received from his personal study of the works under discussion, or the conclusions he has drawn from comparisons of various works one with another. Whatever he says is subject to review by the appellate court of the reader's own intellect; and by offering a stimulus to the exercise of this arbitrament the critic renders to the reader a genuine intellectual service.

The value of criticisms of art lies not so much in the verdicts they pronounce as in the mental processes which they incite. Suggestive criticism is the only valuable criticism; but even the arbitrary *ex cathedra* declarations of the most self-conscious authority may contain fruitful suggestions, and prove a means of grace to the lay reader. The self-assertiveness of Ruskin's critical writing is as notorious as the erroneousness of many of his particular judgments; but the stimulating effect of his out-givings as a whole upon the English people can hardly be overestimated.

What has just been said of the fine arts in general is especially and emphatically true of architecture. This is the greatest of the arts, and the one which touches human life most intimately and at the most points.

It houses us and our business and our worship; its works are around us on every hand; we cannot get away from it. We can get along without pictures and without statues, but we cannot get along without buildings; and buildings become works of architecture the moment they become the objects of the desire to produce what is beautiful. The highest aspirations and the loftiest sentiments have often found in works of architecture their fullest and noblest expression, and buildings have always played a large part in the history of great movements. None other of the arts makes so wide and so general an appeal to the intellect as architecture, which is both a useful art and a fine art. The splendor of its masterpieces appeals even to the uncultivated taste, and their grandeur often stirs the most impassive nature. The higher qualities of the art — refinement, restraint, just proportions, delicacy of detail — call forth the admiration of a less numerous, but more highly educated, public.

The industry of building is, next to that of agriculture, the greatest of all industries, and directly or indirectly gives employment to a notable fraction of the whole population. An important part of our mining and metallurgical activities; the quarrying and transportation of building stone; the manufacture of brick and terra-cotta; the trades of the carpenter, mason, plumber, glazier, painter, and cabinet-maker; the professions of sanitary and civil engineering, with the trades allied to them; the vast lumber interests of the country, and a host of minor activities — all these are maintained in the service of architecture. Together they employ or support millions of men, women, and children. These are all ancillary to the actual work of designing and erecting, of buying and selling, buildings — lines of business in themselves of great importance. An art having so wide an outreach may well be a subject of interest to large numbers outside the ranks of those who are directly concerned in its practice.

The operations of building, moreover, are not carried on out of sight, in studios and workshops. They are conspicuously public, and arrest the attention of every passer-by. One does not need to be learned in engineering to take an intelligent interest in these operations. There is something fascinating in the gradual progress of a building from its deep foundations to its capstone. Out of confusion, dirt, piles of coarse materials, dust, mortar, timber, gray iron beams, brick, and stone, a crowd of busy men, seemingly undisciplined and without any visible commander, little by little bring order, form, and, eventually, beauty. Soiled sheets of tracing-linen and wrinkled and bespattered blue-prints, covered over with a maze of lines and figures, control this chaotic activity and

bring the diverse labors of a score of trades into mutual fitness and harmony.

These diagrams, though hieroglyphics to the uninitiated, are the graphic records of a conception matured and worked out in the mind of the architect. The whole edifice, down to its smallest details, with all its multiplicity of fixtures, devices, pipes, wires, and flues, in all the complexity of its constructive parts of brick, stone, steel, wood, and glass, has been thought out and erected in the mind and imagination of its designer. All this stirring activity of men and machines, this bringing together — from different shops, from different cities, and even from different States and foreign lands — of the constituent elements of the fabric is but the concrete realization of processes which have already been completed in the thought of the architect. There is something marvellous in this organization of forces for the translation of a thought into tangible form. The wonder is great to the spectator to whom not a single step of the complex process is clearly intelligible. Nor does this wonder diminish with increased knowledge; for the more one learns of the "how" and the "why" of these great correlations of thought and action, the better can one grasp their wide and deep significance.

Back of all these operations lies the design which they are intended to reproduce. Behind and above the contractor stands the architect. The form and aspect of the edifice slowly taking shape before the eyes of the public are his creation. The completed design is the product of his reason and imagination working upon a definite problem, some of whose conditions have been imposed upon him by his client's requirements, and others by circumstances and forces beyond the control of either. So far as it has free scope, the taste of the architect determines the artistic quality of the result. A man of strong personality may rise superior to influences which would gravely hamper another of less independence. In general, however — always, in the long run — the average level of artistic excellence in the buildings of any given community is determined by the average artistic culture of its population. Individual buildings may stand far above this level of excellence, but others as far below it will bring down the average to the level of the local taste. In time, every town, village, and city gets just about the sort of architecture it really wants.

This is, after all, only one way of saying that the architecture of any place and age is the natural product and expression of the culture and civilization of that time and place. This is the great and significant fact which gives to the history of architecture its vital interest. Every great

building, every great class of buildings, stands for definite historic causes and forces. The magnificent cathedrals of the Middle Ages are no more conceivable as the products of our own day and generation than is a modern twenty-story office building imaginable in ancient Thebes or Memphis. The forces and movements which have produced the great monuments of architecture constitute a study of the deepest interest. To one who has learned something of how the builder's art responds to the changes which take place in human thought and culture, reflecting in its transformations of style the onward progress or the retrogression of civilization, the great buildings of the world are more eloquent than the pages of the most gifted historian.

The history of architecture is, indeed, simply one department of the history of civilization; but it is a branch of the general subject whose importance educators are only beginning to realize. The directness of the influence upon architecture of movements in themselves purely religious, social, or political is appreciated by very few. Only those who have made it a subject of special study realize how wonderfully the historic styles of architecture interpret the history — not the art-history merely, but the general historic march of events, social, political, religious, commercial, intellectual — of the times to which they belong. All the great ethnic movements, the colonizations, migrations, incursions and conquests of history, have left their mark on architecture. By their buildings we can follow the triumphant march of the Arabs and Moors in the seventh and eighth centuries along the shores of the Mediterranean. Changes in the theology and rubrics of Christendom are written into the varying plans of the churches of early and mediæval Europe. The revolution in the methods and content of human thought which we call the Renaissance brought about a revolution no less complete in architectural art; and one may trace the exact course and progress of this intellectual revolution through Europe by the style of the buildings which arose along its path. The differences of temperament and character between the Greeks and Romans of antiquity are as clearly readable in the aspect of the monuments they have respectively left to the world as in the pages of their poets, philosophers, and historians.

Such examples might be indefinitely multiplied; but these suffice to illustrate the closeness of the relation between the history of architecture and the general history of civilization. This gives to the study of architectural history an interest far transcending that which belongs to it merely as a branch of the history of art. To many, it is true, it suggests nothing but a dry record of the sequence and changes of styles,

and the substitution of one set of decorative forms for another — which sufficiently explains its failure to receive the recognition it deserves. For this too common misapprehension the writers of architectural histories are in part to blame. They have too often themselves taken the narrow view, and, writing chiefly for professional students, who may be supposed to be interested in the technical details of the styles, have failed to treat of the larger aspects of their subject. There is no question that it can be made as dry as the driest of abstractions; but when it is properly handled it becomes a study of wonderful breadth and suggestiveness.

Another obstacle to the growth of popular interest in the history of architecture is the impression that it bristles with technicalities. For this, again, the writers, or at least some writers, of architectural books are to blame, and for the reason already given above, namely, that they have written too exclusively for technical students, and not enough for the general public. As a matter of fact, the technicalities of architecture are not necessarily formidable. There are certain frequently recurring terms whose meaning the reader needs to have explained and to bear in mind; but their number is not great, and it is possible to treat of the historic progress of the art with very little recourse to others than these few and common terms. It is by no means necessary to discuss in detail the scientific and more abstrusely technical phases of architecture, in order to get a clear idea of its history and development. Gothic vaulting, for instance, may be handled on its static and constructive side in such a way as to frighten any reader but a civil engineer, or it may be discussed in simple and lucid language in such a manner as to attract, and hold the attention of, the non-professional reader.

There is a great deal to interest the amateur and layman even in the structural developments of the various forms of building which have prevailed in different periods and countries. There is nothing mysterious or abstruse in the fundamental principles of construction. A child's building-blocks will suffice to illustrate most of those which it is essential for the amateur to understand. The remainder can be elucidated by means almost as simple. All that the ordinary reader requires is what may be called a qualitative acquaintance with these principles; the quantitative determination of the strains and stresses, and of the precise form and dimensions of each member of the structure, belongs to the profession of architectural engineering, with which the lay student does not need to concern himself. This being so, it is possible to present the bearing of these simple and elementary structural principles upon the

development of architectural form in a manner at once intelligible and attractive. The student can hardly fail to become interested in observing how differences in building materials and in scientific or material resources have affected the character and aspect of the buildings of different peoples, and how, with the gradual mastery of this or that principle of construction, at first only imperfectly comprehended, architectural styles have progressed in elegance and perfection in proportion as architects, by this growing mastery, have found themselves more and more unhampered in the expression of their artistic conceptions.

Take, for instance, the Roman use of vaulting. The Egyptians and Chaldaeans had known and applied the principle of the vault long before the Romans began to use it. By what precise paths it reached Rome is not yet wholly clear; but, however that may be, it is quite unlikely that it would ever have come into wide and general use even among the Romans had it not been for their discovery of the practical uses and convenience of hydraulic cement and concrete. This made it possible for them to build enormously massive walls, piers, and abutments at a very low cost, by means of unskilled labor, such as they could get from slaves or common soldiers. It also rendered possible the construction of huge vaulted roofs and ceilings without the use of cut stone or even of brick, by casting them, as it were, on rough moulds or centring of timber or earth. The building of vaults led them, furthermore, to make provision for resisting the enormous outward pressure or thrust exerted by all forms of arched construction, and this radically modified the plans of their buildings; while, at the same time, the adoption of vaulted construction, by emancipating them from dependence upon columns for the support of their ceilings, made possible those vast unencumbered interiors which are the greatest glory of Roman architecture, and delivered these noble structures from the danger of destruction by fire.

The Roman system of decoration was, in its main developments, the natural and logical outcome of this constructive system. Thus, while on the one side the history of Roman architecture may be studied in its relation to the historical and intellectual growths and relations of the Roman people, it is seen in another aspect to be a chapter in the history of the growth and development of a particular structural principle, that of vaulting, which was destined finally to culminate in the glorious works of the mediæval cathedral-builders. A like interest, not inferior in kind or degree, attaches to every chapter of the history of man's efforts to build beautifully.

Another department of architectural reading and study which may

well commend itself to the non-professional reader is that which treats of the general principles of design as applied to buildings. This includes the analytical and critical study of the various styles, as distinguished from the study of their historical and chronological development; and it takes up also those considerations, æsthetic and practical, which enter into the composition of every architectural design. Style, expression, scale, proportion, decoration, the relation of structural to æsthetic requirements, and other topics of like nature essential to the critical appreciation of works of architecture constitute the subject-matter of this line of study. It cannot be said to be represented by any very extensive body of literature; but its substance is to be found widely distributed in essays, chapters, or sections in general treatises, and in detached articles in many magazines and reviews. Viollet-le-Duc's "Discourses on Architecture" is an example of this treatment of architecture for lay students. The English have paid more attention to this branch of literature than our own writers; and its bibliography includes several English manuals which are intended for the general public, and which are eminently suggestive and well conceived.

But, when all is said, the most inspiring thing about architecture is its works. One achievement is worth a score of theories. In the average architectural lecture it is the pictures that count. Great buildings, splendid buildings, beautiful buildings seize hold of the imagination; and they stir emotions which the most eloquent discourse would hardly touch. The great monuments of architecture are something more than the mere handiwork of the architect and master-builder. They appeal to the imagination as if endowed with life and personality. They breathe the spirit of the times which saw them rise slowly from their foundations. The air of antiquity clings to them; or, if they belong to more recent times than deserve that venerable title, the contrast which they offer with the work and taste of commonplace modern things still reminds us that they belong to the past, of which they have preserved, as it were, a petrified fragment for our pleasure and instruction. Great buildings have character and expression. They stir our emotions, and each one strikes a different chord.

Even the stay-at-home may, to some extent, share in these sensations. Nothing, indeed, can take the place of the actual buildings or produce the same impression as that which one experiences who stands in their very presence. But it is also true that the art of photography has gone far to make up for the failure to behold a building with one's own eyes, and that to one who has learned to read plans and sections

the drawings in a book may convey more information than he could obtain in any cursory visit to the structure represented. There are many advantages, indeed, in the study of buildings by their photographs, and by such other illustrations of them as are obtainable, especially plans and sections. Quite apart from the signal saving in time and expense consequent upon bringing the building into one's room instead of having to journey some hundreds or thousands of miles to reach it, there is the immense convenience of being able to examine in detail, and at one's leisure, every part of a complex edifice, on a reduced scale, and to compare widely separated buildings of the same class or style by actually placing them side by side.

Photographs of all the more important structures treated of in the text-books can be obtained for a very small outlay. In the form of blue-prints and of process-cuts or gelatine-prints in black and white, thousands of subjects are to be had for a cent or two apiece; so that it is easy and not at all expensive to extra-illustrate any architectural history one may be engaged in studying. To study the photographs with the text-book in hand, or the historical or critical treatise with the photographs in hand, is an occupation both instructive and entertaining. One comes thereby to know a building with an intimacy second only to that which results from long and repeated visits to the actual structure.

The study of buildings by photographs is an admirable training in careful observation and scientific analysis. In one of our leading schools of architecture there are systematic exercises in this sort of study. Each student is given a plan or view of some noted edifice to analyze and describe in writing; and each in turn is then required to draw a building from it, whereby an effective test is afforded of the clearness and accuracy of the written description, and hence of the writer's powers of observation and analysis. As the writer is also urged to point out any conspicuous merits or defects which he may discover in the design he describes, the exercise also tends to train and develop the critical faculty. This is a kind of study which is perfectly practicable for any non-professional student of architecture who possesses even the most elementary skill in drawing; while for such as do not care to undertake to make drawings from descriptions, it is possible to turn the descriptions to good profit by comparing them with the photographs upon which they were based, and then with other views of the same edifice from other points.

In view of all these considerations, it is not too much to claim that the study of architecture, although it cannot in itself furnish a complete liberal education, comes nearer to it than does any other course

of professional training; for it reaches out, on the one hand, to practical scientific and mechanical interests, and, on the other, to abstract and theoretical culture. Architecture is an art, a science, a business, and a profession. It involves training in all these four forms of knowledge and modes of activity in a manner and to an extent that cannot be alleged of any other single pursuit.

As an artist, the architect must study on its æsthetic side every problem presented to him; for architecture means not merely designing buildings, but designing beautiful buildings. This, indeed, is precisely what differentiates it from engineering. But the practical and utilitarian side of his problem cannot be ignored; for stability, salubrity, and convenience are essential to the very existence of buildings. Provision for the meeting of these requirements is a matter of science. The technic of architecture is chiefly scientific. So far as stability and durability are concerned, architecture is merely a special branch of civil engineering, and the training it demands in this direction is a training in exact calculation, and in the application of mathematics to the designing of foundations, arches, vaults, girders, and roof-trusses. Like the civil engineer, the architect must understand, at least in a general way, how to test iron and steel, mortars and cements, and how to tell good materials from bad with unerring judgment. He must have mastered the principles of sanitary engineering, and must be able to solve the most varied problems of plumbing, drainage, heating, and ventilation. All these are accomplishments of a purely scientific character, and demand of the successful practitioner not only training in various sciences, but also the scientific spirit — the ability to consider his problem from the strictly scientific point of view.

In their relations to business, the profession and the training of the architect are not unlike those of the lawyer. He stands before the law as the trusted representative of his client toward the various contractors employed on the building, and controls large expenditures, running sometimes into millions of dollars. If he thus needs to know as much of business as does the lawyer, he must also have at least as much knowledge of the law as the man of business. He must understand those elements of legal science which lie at the foundation of the important business relations which he is obliged to maintain with both his client and the contractors.

The three learned professions of law, medicine, and theology are chiefly distinguished from trade and business by the intellectual character of the education which they presuppose, by the breadth of culture

which this involves, and by the special relations of trust and confidence in which their practitioners stand toward those who employ them or whom they serve. In these characteristics the architect's place is with the clergyman, the lawyer, and the physician. It is because of the breadth of its intellectual foundations and outlook, and the responsible and intimate personal relation of the architect toward his client, that architecture deserves to rank among the higher professions. The ignorance and dishonesty of individual practitioners no more invalidate this claim than the existence of quacks and charlatans vitiates the high claims of the other professions.

These varied relations give to architectural study an attractiveness which appeals to an exceptionally broad range of tastes and aptitudes. It embraces so many distinct lines of reading and investigation, lends itself to so many diverse points of view, and cultivates withal so catholic a spirit toward departments of knowledge other than those specifically its own, that every seeker after intellectual advancement can find pertinent material somewhere in its broad field. The general reader who seeks from books relaxation or food for mental hunger, outside of his or her special occupation, may open up new avenues of thought and interest by a course of architectural reading.

The materials for such courses have been greatly multiplied in recent years. While the French have for a long time led in the production of both technical works and popular manuals of architecture, they do not now monopolize this field of literature. The number of manuals, textbooks, and works of architectural history and criticism in the English language has been greatly augmented of late years. The non-professional reader is no longer confined to Fergusson and Rosengarten for the history, and to Ruskin's "Stones of Venice" and "Seven Lamps" for the criticism, of architecture. Books in our own language, of all degrees of erudition, from the most popular manual to the most serious and technical treatise and the most sumptuous monograph, are now available in all libraries which make any pretensions to completeness. General treatises, dictionaries, encyclopedias, books on special phases and periods of architecture and on special buildings, manuals and histories of the arts allied to architecture, collections of drawings and views of buildings in various lands, publications issued by archaeological societies and treating of their researches into the arts of antiquity — these are but part of the resources for architectural information and instruction in English which have been added to our libraries within the last few years.

In these additions American students and writers have borne a

creditable part. Most of the books of American origin have the merit, too often wanting in the writings of Europeans, of freedom from national or racial prejudices; treating the historical development of their subject with perfect impartiality. The majority of these recent works, alike English and American, are reasonably free from technicalities, and recognize fully the needs of the non-professional reader; and not a few among them possess decided literary merit, apart from their excellence as architectural treatises. They have been written to meet a genuine popular demand, and their multiplication and ready sale are evidence of the reality and persistence of this demand.

There are many women among the readers of these books; and, indeed, in this, as in so many other lines of literary and general culture among us, it is the women who are taking the lead. The women's colleges and academies are in advance of those for men in recognizing the place which should be given to the history of art in the curriculum of a general education. In many of them the history of architecture has been given a place equally important with that of painting. Women are clamoring for further opportunities to take up this attractive branch of study at educational centres where it has as yet received no recognition. They have discovered, with a keen and almost intuitive perception of relative values, the intellectual fascination and artistic interest of architecture. They have yielded readily to its attraction; finding that it exacts of them no burdensome and unreasonable amount of technical preparation, and gives large returns in the broadening of intellectual sympathies and appreciations, and in the quickening of æsthetic sensibilities.

The study of architecture by amateurs as a liberal art, not a technical pursuit, is a sure and safe road to a better and broader appreciation of the other arts. It is an excellent foundation on which to build the critical and historical study of the fine arts in general, and an almost equally admirable basis for the study of political and social history. The public libraries and the fireside lend themselves to the pursuit of such studies; and for thousands who have never yet entered this field it holds in store great and lasting delights. The popularizing of architectural reading must make for the improvement of the public taste, and must result, in the long run, in better architecture, both public and private, in the artistic improvement of all public enterprises, in the beautifying of our cities, and in the addition of much charm and delight to all the visible accompaniments of life.

A. D. F. HAMLIN.

WRITERS IN THE JULY FORUM.

MR. CHAMPE S. ANDREWS comes from a family of distinguished lawyers. Is son of Col. Garnett Andrews, the author of "Andrews' Mississippi Digest," and grandson of Judge Garnett Andrews, who was for twenty-four years on the bench of Georgia, and was the author of several legal and political works. Is a first honor graduate of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Alabama. Served during the Spanish-American War as a Captain in the Third Regiment of Tennessee Volunteer Infantry, and is now Adjutant of the New York Corps Spanish War Veterans, and a member of the Board of Officers of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-American War. Frequently served as Judge Advocate of general courts martial. Is a member of the firm of Hill, Stürcke & Andrews, of New York City. This firm is counsel to the Medical Society of the County of New York, incorporated in 1806. Mr. Andrews is counsel to the Medical Society of the State of New York, the recognized organization of the medical profession in this State.

REPRESENTATIVE HENRY SHERMAN BOUTELL was born in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1856. Was taken West by his parents in 1863. Graduated from Northwestern University in 1874 and from Harvard in 1876. In 1877 received the degree of A.M. from Harvard for post-graduate studies in International Law and Constitutional History. Was admitted to the Illinois bar, and to the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States in 1879. Has since practised in Chicago. Was elected a member of the 55th Congress as a Republican from the North Side District of Chicago, and was reelected to the 56th and the 57th Congresses. Made in the House of Representatives the first argument offered in the first session of the 56th Congress in support of the absolute power of Congress to regulate and dispose of territory acquired by the United States, basing his position upon the historical precedents established by the purchase of Louisiana and the sale of Texas.

MR. ROBERT CLARK was graduated from Amherst College in 1892. Afterward studied psychology, pedagogy, etc., at the New York School of Pedagogy and at Clark University. Has held positions as tutor, and has taught in public and private schools.

MR. JOHN CORBIN was born in Chicago, in 1870. Graduated at Harvard in 1892, A.M. in 1893. Resided for a year at Balliol College, Oxford. Has been a frequent contributor to various leading publications, and was formerly dramatic critic of "Harper's Weekly" and assistant editor of "Harper's Magazine." Is author of "The Elizabethan Hamlet" and of "Schoolboy Life in England: an American View."

MR. ALFRED DWIGHT FOSTER HAMLIN was born in 1855, at Constantinople, Turkey, where his father, the late Rev. Dr. Cyrus Hamlin, afterward President of Robert College, Constantinople, and later of Middlebury College, Vermont, was then a missionary. Was graduated from Amherst College in 1875, A.M. in 1885. Studied architecture in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Boston, and the *École des Beaux Arts*, Paris, 1876-81. Practised architecture on his return to the United States in 1881. In 1883 was appointed a special assistant to Prof. W. R. Ware in the Department of Architecture at Columbia College, and has ever since been connected with

that institution, now Columbia University. Has been Adjunct Professor since 1891. Is author of "A History of Architecture" (1898), and is a contributor to Sturgis' "Dictionary of Architecture" and many architectural periodicals.

REV. HERBERT W. HORWILL was born at Sandown, England, in 1864. Was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, where he graduated with high honors, including the Chancellor's prize. In 1887 took the M. A. degree at London University, with the gold medal in classics. Is a minister of one of the Methodist churches of England, but for reasons of health retired from full pastoral work in 1896, since which time he has been closely connected with religious journalism in London, both as contributor and as editor. Is now engaged in literary work in New York City. Has published a volume of sermons entitled "The Old Gospel in the New Era."

MR. WALTER MACARTHUR was born at Glasgow, Scotland, in 1862. In 1876 went to sea, and followed that occupation in British and American ships until 1891, in which year he became manager of the "Coast Seamen's Journal," of San Francisco. In 1895 assumed the editorship of that publication. Mr. Macarthur has officiated in a number of important positions in the interest of organized labor in general.

REV. GILBERT REID, D.D., was born on Long Island in 1857. Graduated in 1879 from Hamilton College, and in 1882 from Union Theological Seminary. Commenced missionary work in China the same year in connection with the Presbyterian Church. In 1894 withdrew from the Presbyterian Board, and undertook a new mission among the higher classes, from which has grown the International Institute of China. Dr. Reid is author of "Glances at China," "Reunion of Christendom," and other works.

MR. W. C. JAMESON REID was born in 1872 at Shanghai, where his father was stationed in the service of the English government. After travelling through Europe, he journeyed across Siberia by the caravan route to Peking in 1893. In 1894 took part in an exploring expedition in Eastern Tibet. His later travels have been in British Columbia in 1896, in the Philippines in 1897, in Mexico and Central America in 1898, in Tibet and Siam in 1899, and again in China and the Philippines in 1900. Has published, in addition to many newspaper and magazine articles, two books on Tibet and one on political matters in the East.

MR. JACOB SCHOENHOF was born in Germany in 1839. Came to America in 1861, was naturalized in 1868, and followed a commercial career up to 1885. His experience in trade and manufacturing soon brought him to recognize the antagonism of facts with the generally accepted economic views. As early as 1869 he published in German periodicals his views on the errors of economic theories. President Cleveland appointed him Consul to Tunstall, England, and gave him a commission to inquire into the state of technical education and the economy of production in Europe. Mr. Schoenhoef is the author of "Wages and Trade" (1885); "The Economy of High Wages" (1892); "History of Money and Prices" (1890), etc.

PRESIDENT CHARLES FRANKLIN THWING, born at New Sharon, Maine, in 1853, was graduated from Harvard in 1876, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1879. In 1890 became President of Western Reserve University and Adelbert College and allied institutions in Cleveland, Ohio. President Thwing is the author of several works on American colleges and college life.

REPRESENTATIVE OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD was born in Louisville, Kentucky, in 1862. Was educated at the Rugby School, Louisville, and at the University of Virginia. Began law practice at Birmingham, Alabama, in 1884. Was chairman of the Democratic executive committee of the 9th Alabama district in 1892, and has been a member of Congress from that district since 1895.

THE FORUM.

VOL. XXXI, NO. 6.

AUGUST, 1901.

NEW YORK:

THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

COPYRIGHT, 1900,
BY THE FORUM PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PRESS OF
THE PUBLISHERS' PRINTING COMPANY
82, 84 LAFAYETTE PLACE
NEW YORK

The Forum

AUGUST, 1901.

THE FAILURE OF THE TWO-PARTY SYSTEM.

SINCE the demoralizing defeat of the Bryanized Democratic party at the last election, many former Democrats, notably certain former leaders of the Cleveland type, have persistently urged that the party should "get together," or be organized, along the old conservative lines. In all this contention, singularly enough, it seems to be assumed that it is not only practicable, but desirable, for the so-called Cleveland Democrats and those who espouse the present Bryan organization to work together in one party. It seems to me that this proposition is neither practicable nor desirable; or, at any rate, that it would not be desirable, even if it were, at present, approximately practicable. In short, has not the bi-party system had its day, and would not a nominal or attempted continuance of it be illogical and unwholesome? Have not the divisions between hard-and-fast Republicanism, conservative Democracy, and Populism been sufficiently persistent and marked to leave no doubt as to the correct answer to this question?

The two great English-speaking nations and the self-governing English colonies have adhered, substantially, to the bi-party system, while in Germany and France there are many parties, groups, or wings under distinct names. In the present German Reichstag there are about a dozen of these party groups with a membership varying from only three or four to one hundred. The members of each of these parties or groups are elected on account of a few specific principles which they and their supporters regard as of paramount importance. They are not called upon to stultify themselves by subscribing to principles which they do

not believe in, as is the case under the omnibus party system of this country and England. Our system puts a blanket mortgage on truthfulness and on independent thought and action.

How vividly one still remembers the immoral spectacle of the delegates from the prairie and mining States going to the St. Louis convention, in 1896, shouting for silver, and coming back shouting for gold! The only explanation they offered, or could offer, for their absurd self-contradiction was the stupid shibboleth, "We are Republicans." Before the Chicago convention prescribed free silver as a panacea for the business depression which had clouded its economic vision and goaded it into a desperate temper, a large number of Democrats were stoutly opposed to such a policy, and believed it to be immoral, inexpedient as a party measure, and menacing to business interests. Yet, after the convention had adopted the silver policy, most of the members of the party fell into line and declared that it was good. And, though the silver question became the vital issue of the campaign, many thousands of gold standard Democrats defended it, and excused their self-stultification on the ground that the declaration of the convention was party law, and that they were therefore bound by it. Such pernicious spectacles are an inevitable result of the bi-party system, under present conditions. In 1896 we heard for the first time, I think, the definite assertion of the dogma that men are made for parties, and not parties for men.

But for the assumption, based on conditions which had long ceased to exist, that it was practicable and essential to maintain the two-party system, instead of the fiasco and false pretence of the organization which resulted from the Indianapolis convention, there would have been formed there, in good faith, a party composed of "sound money" Democrats — excepting those who were prepared to make the movement a mere adjunct of the Republican party — and large numbers of disaffected Republicans who have stayed with their party only because there was nowhere else that they could consistently go, or no other organization with which they could efficiently work. The party alignment was even more incongruous in 1900 than in 1896. If it had not been for the preconception that there can be only two parties under our system of government, the organization begun at Indianapolis would have grown so that it might have been a formidable opponent of the Republican party at the late national election, and would have had a good chance for success at the congressional elections in 1902.

If anyone thinks this statement extravagant, let him recall the crisis of the Kansas City convention, when Mr. Bryan insisted that it should

declare for free silver, not only against its judgment as to expediency, but obviously, I think, against the belief of a majority of its members. This is the first time that a great council of freemen deliberately lied by resolution; and the stupid immorality of that act would in itself have been sufficient to seal the party's fate in the contest. But for the two-party bias there would have been a refuge in an organization of strength and prestige to which all but the Populistic element represented at the Kansas City convention would have fled. The numbers of Republicans who would have sought the same refuge from the general imperialistic policy and from the extravagance and attendant corruption of Republicanism would have been formidable, and, not unlikely, decisive of the result of the contest. For it was fear of Bryanism and not devotion to Republicanism which made the Waterloo of 1900. Bryanism would then have stood for what it legitimately is and means, namely, Populism.

This rational division would have cleared the political atmosphere from demoralizing confusion, and would have averted the disorganization and spirit of hopelessness which possess all opposition elements. The conservative Democrats and the Populists would certainly have controlled the House of Representatives. They would have acted together on the Cuban and Philippine policy, against the ship subsidy bill, in favor of checking Republican extravagance, in favor of reforming tariffs and regulating corporations, and, in general, along anti-monopoly and economical lines, in accordance with the real predominating public sentiment. The Democrats proper would have stood with the Republicans against disturbing the money standard, and against any violent change in economic policies. Thus, without inconsistency or self-stultification, the two opposition parties would have been able to check the now unbridled faults of Republicanism, and, in some measure, beneficent and progressive policies would have been forwarded.

If there had been created a well-organized party of conservatively inclined Democrats, it would stand in the campaign of 1902 for a policy advocating the conciliation of the Philippines and probably pointing clearly toward the ultimate autonomy of those islands; for keeping absolutely our pledges to Cuba; for the traditional Democratic economy and honesty in administration; and for taking away from commercial combinations of a monopolistic character all such special props and privileges as protective and discriminating customs and railway tariffs. Such a party would at once cause, and profit by, a formidable division of the Republican party. The third, or Populistic, party, whether led by Mr.

Bryan or not, would comprise believers in the immediate public ownership of telegraphs and railways, and in doing away with the national banks and substituting for their notes currency issued directly by the government. In general, it would be an "advanced," but not a socialistic, party. Such a party, while it should not be put in full power now, would have a distinct place and mission, and would exert a wholesome influence. These two parties would be able to throw the election of the next President into the House of Representatives, which they would certainly control — unless, indeed, the Democrats should elect their candidate for President. Thus, the choice of an anti-Republican for President would be assured. The Executive and the Popular House would stand for all that conservative Democrats believe in, excepting the present money policy, which could not be disturbed. Under such an arrangement the Senate would, before long, become anti-Republican, and it would be at once brought by moral force to yield in part to the majority as represented in the Lower House.

Of the 397 members of the German Reichstag about 80 are classed as Conservatives, 102 as Clericals, about 100 as Liberals, and 57 as Social Democrats. While the Clericals stand, primarily, for the advancement of the interests of the Roman Catholic Church, on most of the other important questions they are naturally allied with the Conservatives; and the Agrarians, who stand for the interests of the landowners, are found in these two parties. While the Conservatives, including the Clericals, are the most numerous division of the Reichstag, they are less than a majority. Though the platform of the Social Democrats demands the public control and ownership of all property and industries, they do not push this radical principle forward at all, but strive for such reform measures as would improve the condition of the masses under the present individualistic system. It is curious to note that most of the reforms demanded in the platform of this radical party are commonly accepted and established principles in this country, and have long been incorporated in our laws and institutions. Among them are: (1) universal suffrage with a secret ballot; (2) decision by the people as to peace or war; (3) militia in preference to a standing army; (4) freedom of the press, of speech, and of assembly; (5) popular education by the state, though to a more radical degree than in the United States; (6) declaration that religion is a private matter; (7) shortening of working-days and abolition of child labor, etc.

The Liberals, Social Democrats, and all minor opponents of the Conservatives may combine to carry measures on which all agree, without

stultification or demoralization of their party integrity or organization; and this is the common method of procedure in the German Parliament. Theoretically this method or system is not as efficient as the two-party system of England and our own country. In fact, however, little seems to be lost in point of efficiency under the group or many-party system, as compared with the two-party system, while a great deal is gained in honesty and consistency.

Since the defeat of Gladstone's home rule bill by the House of Lords in 1886, the English system of government, which presupposes two effective parties, has been dormant or inert. Though English politicians and writers are still disputing over the question why the Liberal party has never had any effective strength since that time, the reason is doubtless to be found in the loss of public confidence and in the demoralization which resulted from Gladstone's impracticable measure for Irish autonomy. If the Liberal element in English politics, that is, the element opposed in a general way to the ultra-Conservative or reactionary Tory element, had not been restrained by the two-party habit, there might have been formed, in the early eighties, out of the opposition element, two parties of Liberal proclivities, differing in the main in their degree of progressiveness or radicalism. These would have found a common rallying-point as opponents of the later Tory jingo colonial policy; and the suspension, if not the breakdown, of the English system of party government would have been averted. In particular, the united opposition of these two anti-Tory parties to the course which precipitated the unnecessary, indefensible, and calamitous Boer war would have been able to prevent it.

It is true that no other system is so efficient in carrying out specific and positive public sentiment, that is, the commands of the majority, as a two-party plan, provided, however, that the parties are nicely balanced as to strength and homogeneous in composition. But the lack of these conditions has demoralized, if not destroyed, the much-vaunted two-party government in England; and, in regard to carrying out the expressed orders of the majority, it has been a delusion and a snare in the United States. From 1874 to 1894 the country was Democratic, taking the all but uniform majorities in the popular House of Congress as a test.

This test of twenty years of time and ten general elections is manifestly conclusive. Of the ten Congresses chosen during this period the Republicans controlled but two — in the Lower House — which were gained in the presidential years of 1880 and 1888. The Republicans were able to gain control of the House in 1894, and of all branches of

the government in 1896, for two reasons, either of which would have been sufficient to bring about the change. The first reason was that economic storm conditions which had been developing for many years happened to be precipitated into a panic while the Democrats were in power; and it is a well-known phenomenon that such calamities are always charged against the political powers that be, regardless of justice. The second reason was that magnetic healers, who always have their day in such circumstances, were able to persuade the excited and restive majority of the Democratic organization that nostrums were efficacious remedies for the economic disease in question. On account of this opportunism, which, it should be said, was also a manifestation of an underrcurrent of genuine anti-monopoly sentiment, Republicans have easily held complete control ever since. But it is doubtful whether the country has been Republican in regard to positive political principles since 1874. It has been merely anti-Democratic for the reasons given. But during the twenty years in which the people persistently endorsed Democratic principles and policies, there was only a single opportunity for the Democratic party to execute the popular commission, and that was in the early part of Cleveland's second administration. During all the rest of the long period either the Executive or the Senate or both were hostile to the Popular House.

It is not irrelevant to remark that under the only logical form of modern parliamentary government, namely, the Cabinet or responsible system, the principles and reforms which the majority adopted and ordered by the election of successive Democratic Congresses would have been executed very soon after they were first so adopted and ordered. However, the intermixture of tariff reform and free silver sentiment in both of the great parties was no doubt responsible for the fatuous failure of the Democracy to carry out its mission of tariff and other reforms when at last it had the chance in a contemporaneous Democratic Executive and Congress. Under the group or many-party system, tariff reformers of all parties or groups might have consistently united for the single purpose of reforming the tariff, and it seems fair to believe that they would have done so. Thus, a fair test of this great reform would have been accomplished under normal business conditions before the panic destroyed its chance of vindicating itself or winning popular favor. This much, at least, may be confidently averred: there could be no stronger proof or more vivid illustration of inefficiency and failure to carry out the popular will under our present system than was afforded by the experience of the twenty years in question.

Complaint of the overweening power of the executive at the expense of the legislative arm of the government has grown apace. It is charged that, with the powerful influence of official patronage now at his command, the President compels the Congress to abdicate its functions at his will. The Bacon resolution, for example, which would have reversed the Philippine policy, was only defeated by the casting vote of the Vice-President, while but for the tremendous potentiality of executive official patronage the real sentiment of the Senate and of the country might have been expressed and adopted.

Under the natural evolution of parliamentary government in England, executive interference with the power of the Parliament has been by this time abolished. In France and other European countries which have the Cabinet form of government a like repression of the executive has been virtually accomplished. Our Constitution, having been cast in a written mould before modern parliamentary government was developed, and being in practice as unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians, has perpetuated the ancient and out-of-date enormous powers it originally gave to our "emperor." For our Constitution has not been amended since 1803, except in relation to the moral and emotional question of African slavery; while the formation of European constitutions has been of comparatively recent date. Under the two-party system the choice of the executive, and so the whole policy of the government during an entire presidential term, may again and again turn upon some temporary question which excites the fear of the voters, such as the silver question.

The only way open by which we may return to a government by the people through their representatives, or rather the only way for us to reach for the first time such a government, from which we are separated by a hundred years of arrested constitutional development, seems to be by throwing the choice of the President as often as possible into the House of Representatives. The Executive would then be in touch with the direct representatives of the people, and would cooperate with them in carrying out their expressed wishes as to leading issues at least. To be abreast of modern political progress we ought to be able to make the executive the servant of the legislative department, as in all European governments except Germany, and in Australia and Canada; but short of that our Presidents should be confined as strictly as possible within their constitutional province; and their tendency to procure or obstruct legislation by the influence of official patronage or by other methods should be checked.

The two-party system is more practicable in England than in this country, because there the principle of the public ownership of public utilities, such as telegraphs, street railways, etc., is established; and the only question now is how far public ownership and operation shall enter the field of what has heretofore been conceded to be properly private enterprise. In this country, on the other hand, this great question of the control or ownership of a certain class of industries is still under discussion; and members of the two great parties are not divided with reference to it along party lines. Under the group or poly-party system it would be practicable for members of the present parties to ally themselves with a special public ownership or anti-corporation party or group with reference to that particular question, while they still adhered to their old party so far as its general principles or traditions were concerned.

For at least twenty years Republicans and Democrats have been intricably mixed as to the silver question, and, in a lesser degree, as to the tariff question. This fact has seriously affected the *morale* of the Republican party, while it has utterly demoralized the Democratic party. There should long ago have been in the Congress two groups, one distinctively pro-silver and the other distinctively for tariff reform, whose members would have made those questions paramount, while as to other questions they might have remained conservative or radical, Republican or Democratic. Ever since the time of the leadership of Samuel J. Randall, the Democratic party, though most of the time in numbers the ruling party of the nation, has been impotent by reason of the outgrown policy which attempts to confine everybody within the hard-and-fast lines of one or the other of two parties. For many years before the leaven of the folly had worked its present utter demoralization, this party exerted a powerful and wholesome influence, though only in a negative way. It is chiefly because it has been a heterogeneous and incongruous combination, pretending to be homogeneous, that it has won the reputation of being a do-nothing party.

Able writers have recently been taking much pains to show that the Democratic party, because it has ideals and is devoted to principles, is inefficient when in power, and is only useful through its moral influence as a check to corruption and bad measures and an inspiration to higher aims and standards. On the other hand, Republicans accomplish practical purposes because they have no ideals, but are possessed by an opportunism which subordinates principles to expediency, and improves each shining hour to gain its ends. While there is some truth in this statement of the practical difference between the two parties, it is

greatly overstated, and the asserted reason for it is fallacious. It is true that the very concept of Democracy involves devotion to altruistic ideals and principles, not, however, of a fanciful or impracticable sort, but quite the contrary. In the single opportunity which it has had for action in half a century, the Democratic party, thanks to the absurd working of our Constitution, as pointed out above, was impotent, indeed, not, however, by reason of any inefficiency or impotency inherent in a democracy, but on account of the incongruous and heterogeneous composition of this particular organization.

The Randall wing, which by the test of the party's main profession of faith was not Democratic at all, was yet, for years, strong enough to balk the party's chief practical purpose, and to weaken its moral strength. From 1878 to the formal and logical disruption in 1896, the attempt of the silver and anti-silver wings of the party to work together was more absurd and impracticable than the attempt of the two tariff wings to work together. During the time in question, moreover, there was a difference between the anti-monopoly or advanced element and the monopoly or reactionary element quite as real and distinct, if not as obvious, as the differences in relation to the tariff and silver. The principal leaders of the party in the Northeastern States were of the capitalistic class until the revolution of 1896. That revolution was, in fact, largely caused by opposition to the monopolistic spirit and tendency of the Cleveland régime; and the silver crusade served, in part, as the occasion and medium of its manifestation. The later career of the Democratic party, instead of supporting the far-fetched theory that a party devoted to principles and inclined to reforms is inefficient, rather illustrates the trite truism that a party which is not homogeneous and compact in its composition is weak and unable to achieve practical success — in short, that a house divided against itself will fall.

After the close of the Civil War the Republican party entered with its inherited military discipline and aggressiveness upon what has been, judged from a very practical and short-sighted view, a remarkably successful career. Its spirit of aggression was stimulated by the lust of power and the attendant spoils of office, then unrestrained and unlimited either by the spirit of fairness, by regard for public decency, or by the letter of a civil service code based upon merit. To defend the possession of this power and these spoils against inevitable reaction and opposition in the North, the utterly unfit negroes were enfranchised so as to overwhelm the comparatively intelligent white voters. Overreaching Republicanism thus unwittingly created the "solid South" for its oppo-

nents, and thus in 1874 gave the Democratic party the popular ascendancy which, as we have seen, it held for twenty years; though under our obstructive Constitution the Republicans were still left in possession of the government and the spoils for three-fifths of the time. They increased these perquisites by voting themselves the additional subsidy of a high protective tariff. The Republican party was thus kept intact chiefly by the "cohesive power of public plunder;" the strong anti-tariff and anti-monopoly sentiment of the Western States yielding in the main to its spell. Though there was a considerable and genuine sentiment on the part of Democrats of the great Northeastern States in favor of restoring home rule to the South, yet, aside from this, the party affiliation between the solid South and the Democratic States of the North was unnatural and in many respects incongruous.

The demonstration of this proposition came at the first opportunity, namely, when for the first time the Democrats, during Cleveland's second administration, came into control of the legislative and executive power—that is, of the power to act. President McKinley, shrewdly enumerating in his recent speech at New Orleans the interests and beliefs common to the South and to the Republicans of the North, observed that while he was a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Republican demand for protection for Northern manufacturers was matched by the appetite of Southern members for a sugar tariff. This reminder brought cynical smiles to the faces of those Northern Democrats, who in the enthusiasm of youth, some thirty years ago, in a political way pledged "their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor" to the cause of redeeming the South from carpet-bag rule and ruin; and it called to mind President Cleveland's bitter letter written to Mr. Catchings, when he came to realize that, owing largely to the "communism of self," the boon of home rule which Northern Democratic self-sacrifice had secured for that section had been rewarded by the betrayal of the struggle of a generation in the cause of tariff reform. The humiliating and disastrous outcome of this heterogeneity of the Democratic party will not soon be forgotten; nor is it possible to calculate the harm done to the country in thus being left under the party government system but without an opposition party of solidarity or strength enough to challenge seriously the policies or the excesses of the party in power.

In refutation of the contention that the Democratic party has been inefficient in comparison with the opportunist Republican party, because it has been devoted to ideals, theories, and principles, we have but to call to mind the tremendous strength and consistency with which it pressed

its traditional principle or ideal of economical and honest administration, and, considering the formidable material odds against it, the wonderful victories it won by the power of that devotion under Tilden and Cleveland. Nor should we forget its splendid practical victories in forcing the administration of Mr. Hayes to adopt its policy of home rule and no military interference in the South, or the practical fact of the civil service reform which it forced a hostile Republican administration to adopt. The weakness of the Democratic party in other respects, during its brief period of power, lay in the fact that it was organized upon territorial rather than economic lines, that its basis was a section rather than a sentiment of the country.

It is significant that in Mr. Bryan's home State one hears his former Democratic followers freely questioning the expediency of his further leadership of the party and the wisdom of his policies, while his Populist neighbors seem to be drawing closer to him and are increasingly warm in his defence. This country is not ripe for a Socialistic party of any practical strength or importance. The Populists who are socialistic in respect to the control and ownership of all so-called natural monopolies or public utilities, but strongly individualistic in respect to other classes of property, naturally take the place of the socialists as the advance or radical party, and they seem to regard Mr. Bryan as their natural leader. If he would but say the word which, on account of his dual function as leader of both the Democratic and Populistic parties, under their confused fusion, he has never spoken, and would declare himself in favor of "government ownership," that would at once advance him to the place of *de jure* as well as *de facto* leader of the Populist party. There would then result three well-defined parties with rational, honest, and distinct beliefs and principles, in place of the heterogeneous, crazy-quilt combinations of which all our present parties are constituted.

I do not, however, lose sight of the possibility that, under the pressure of the present acute economic conditions, large numbers of Republicans, as well as largely predominating numbers of the Democratic party, may soon be ready to adopt the strongly anti-monopolistic principles of the Populists — in the main those in relation to the public ownership of public utilities. But it is not likely, I think, that these issues will, for a long time, become so prominent outside the Populistic party as to overshadow other distinctively Democratic principles, or other principles of a large number of dissatisfied or rebellious Republicans.

ALBERT WATKINS.

THE GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT AT BUFFALO.

AT every important exposition held in this country during recent years, the United States Government has been a principal exhibitor. This policy was inaugurated at the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia; it was followed at New Orleans, Cincinnati, Chicago, Atlanta, Nashville, and Omaha; it is now in force at Buffalo. A large building, which is itself a part of the display, is filled with objects illustrating the work, the functions, and the resources of the Government; making for the thoughtful visitor a veritable museum of public affairs.

Why should the Government enter upon this field of activity? To gratify local pride and assist local enterprise? To supply the public with a midsummer's amusement? Large appropriations are not made by Congress for reasons such as these. At every exposition the strict constructionist grumbles, saying, "This is the last time"; but precedent rules, and the next appropriation is more easily made than the one preceding. For Omaha, \$200,000; for Buffalo, \$500,000; more still, probably, for the Government display at St. Louis; and so it goes. Is the expense justifiable, and, if so, on what grounds?

The welfare of a republic demands that the people shall understand and appreciate the Government which they have created. Every agency which contributes to this end deserves encouragement; every one is needed. In fact, the people know less of their Government than they should know. They have patriotic faith, but that is not enough; they have printed reports, which few read; they seek other information. Only to a limited extent does the average citizen come in personal contact with governmental agencies. He may never see a ship or a fort; taxation touches him indirectly; of all the administrative forces the post-office alone falls under the general observation. An excusable ignorance is almost universally prevalent. What should a Nebraskan know of the light-house service? What does a Vermonter see of Indian reservations? The Department of Agriculture investigates the cotton-worm in Texas, but the citizen of Oregon must pay his share of the bill. New York harbor is improved, and Kansas is taxed for it. In each case the common welfare is at stake, but how is the machinery operated? On

this point even a member of Congress may have strangely vague ideas, applying to one executive department for information which relates to the work of another. Every administrative officer in Washington can tell of just such misconceptions.

An exhibit like that which the Government now has in place at Buffalo is a report to the people of its work. It is a report in the form of an object-lesson, which even the least-educated visitor can understand. It is more effective than the printed report, and equally legitimate as a means of disseminating information. The citizen who intelligently visits the Government Building at the Pan-American Exposition learns to appreciate the public service more highly than before, and he returns to his home a better American. The exhibit is a help to patriotism, a stimulus to national pride. Comparatively few of our people can ever visit Washington; but even there, at the very seat of Government, no such summary of its work can be found. There everything is scattered; at Buffalo it is condensed, prepared especially for exhibition, and labelled. Some things, like the work of the life-saving service and the coining of money, cannot be seen in Washington at all. At the Pan-American Exposition they are admirably represented; and attendants to explain the work are with the exhibits. The beneficial effects of previous expositions furnish the arguments by which the present display is justified.

For the exhibit of the United States Government at Buffalo, the sum of \$500,000 was appropriated; \$200,000 being set aside for the erection of buildings. The latter were constructed under the direction of the supervising architect of the Treasury Department; the exhibits themselves were placed in charge of a board consisting of twelve members representing severally the eight executive departments of the Government, the Smithsonian Institution, the Commission of Fish and Fisheries, the Bureau of American Republics, and the Department of Labor. This board, made up of men in the regular public service, who receive no extra compensation for their added duties, has more than ordinary powers. It allots the appropriation among the several departments, considering not their official rank, but their importance as exhibitors; under it the exhibits are organized, installed, maintained, and finally returned. Seven of its members have had experience in former expositions, where they have learned to pull together and to subordinate individual preferences and the ambitions of single bureaus to the general welfare; and so a unity of effect has been developed which was lacking at Philadelphia and Chicago.

At Chicago the Government Building contained ten distinct exhibits under ten members of a board, each one regardless of the others in color-scheme, decorations, and methods of installation. At Buffalo the Government exhibit has the appearance of one fine display, and yet the individuality of the several departments is preserved. Exposition work has grown to be almost a profession by itself, and experience in it goes a long way toward securing satisfactory results. The essential continuity of the Government board from Chicago to Buffalo has contributed much toward the effectiveness of the present exhibition. Even the Government Building illustrates the same progress toward coherence of design. In the White City the United States was represented by a huge brownish structure, which was absolutely out of harmony with all its surroundings. At the Pan-American Exposition the building is part of the general architectural scheme, which was worked out by all the architects in repeated conferences. Unity of purpose, harmony of effect, and, withal, an abundant diversity of detail are the products of this policy.

The magnitude of the Government exhibit is easily indicated, even though its size gives no hint as to its quality. The main building is essentially rectangular, measuring 418 feet by 130, and is connected by colonnades with two annexes, each 100 feet square. In round numbers about 75,000 square feet of floor space are thus available for exhibition purposes. But this is not all. On the shore of the Park Lake another structure houses a crew of the life-saving service, who demonstrate every day the nature of their duties. The life-boat is launched, the crew is drilled in its management, and a sailor is rescued by the life-line from a mast, in order that the public may see, at ease and in comfort, the performance of a task which the same men may practise next winter on a stormy shore, with their own lives in danger and a wrecked ship close at hand. At the north end of the Government Building a mimic parapet, the copy of a modern fortification, protects a battery of guns, whose mechanism is shown in operation at stated intervals of time. The visitor has heard of the disappearing gun carriage; there it is, where he may behold its actual working. South of the building, a field hospital, complete in all its details, is exhibited; and there you can see how your friend in the Philippines will be cared for if he happens to be ill or wounded. A company of coast artillery and a battalion of marines are also encamped near by, to show the daily life of our defenders. All this is outside the main body of the Government exhibit, an overflow, so to speak, but none the less important for exposition purposes.

Upon entering the Government Building the visitor finds himself

beneath an enormous dome. All around him are the exhibits of the several departments, and overhead are flags and draperies, which serve partly as decorations and partly to mask the rough woodwork of the original interior. To appreciate fully what has been done one should have seen the structure before the work of installation began. The building itself was regarded by the supervising architect as the exhibit of his office, something which should hold its own in comparison with the other architecture of the exposition; and so his resources were mainly expended upon the exterior. Within, it was left rough and unfinished — a huge barn with undressed timbers, unpainted walls, and a general air of unsightliness. To transform this unpromising interior into something effective was the first problem of installation; and its solution, if not perfect, is fairly satisfactory. To make a background for the exhibits the walls were covered with dull red burlap; the rough wooden or iron posts were converted into decorative columns. The rawness was at least hidden, and a harmonious effect was produced. Throughout the building one color-scheme prevails, and that was chosen on the basis of past experience in various museums and at other expositions. The decoration of such a building is the foundation for a successful exhibit. A bad background might spoil everything.

Returning to the exhibits proper, the first impression is one of extraordinary completeness. And yet many things are lacking. The census is unrepresented, for its director felt that an exhibit would be premature. The revenue service, the pension office, and the great accounting divisions of the Government are missing, for the reason that they had nothing which could be advantageously shown. Only those bureaus appear whose work is capable of being exhibited in something like concrete form — a rule to which there are a few exceptions that call for no discussion here. The philosophy of government and its clerical machinery do not admit of material display: material objects are the available features of an exposition. There is, nevertheless, abundant food for thought in one of these Government exhibits. A young man was shown through the Government Building at Atlanta by an attendant, who took pains to explain many things in detail. Upon leaving, the visitor said: "I have often thought that I should like to hold an official position in Washington, but I fear that I do not know enough." Everything he had seen impressed him with the idea that it represented the work of trained intelligence, and that in such a service the untrained man was of little value. He had received an object-lesson in the true significance of civil service reform. Every exhibit is the product of special knowl-

edge, and the more carefully it is scrutinized the more apparent does that truth become.

If the visitor has been to former expositions, his next impression will be one of likeness to what he has seen before. Here are the same articles, shown in much the same way; and yet a closer inspection reveals differences. To a certain extent sameness is unavoidable. The Government, as represented at Buffalo, has changed but little in the three years which have passed since the exposition at Omaha; and, although it has some progress to its credit, there are few novelties to present. Some things and some methods are new, however, and the installation is distinctly better. During the Omaha Exposition the United States was at war with Spain, and the exhibits of the army and the navy were seriously crippled. Their resources were in use elsewhere; guns and equipments could not be spared for show; but the conditions which then ruled no longer exist, and the implements of warfare are now lavishly displayed.

The results of the war are also illustrated by a collection of articles from the Philippine Islands — a collection which was gathered especially for this exposition by an agent of the board. It fills one-fourth of the space in the North Annex; and, although it is merely a beginning, it tells much concerning the peoples and products of our new possessions. Hawaii, also, is represented under the Bureau of Education by an exhibit from its schools, and under the Geological Survey by a relief map of the islands. Another relief map gives the topography of Porto Rico. Both models were prepared for use at the exposition.

Here we get a suggestion as to certain permanent gains to the Government which accrue through the medium of its exhibits. At every exposition some new things are acquired, which are preserved afterward in Washington. The Filipino collection will go to the United States National Museum; the relief maps are but two of a large series which have been made at various times for exposition purposes. Nearly every department has something of like character to its credit.

For Buffalo the National Museum has had constructed the finest groups of Indian figures, family groups in most cases, which the world has ever seen; and in coöperation with the Geological Survey it has made a full-sized restoration of the skeleton of Triceratops, one of the gigantic extinct monsters whose bones were discovered by Marsh. This work is permanent, and remains the property of the people after the exposition closes. The value of the exhibition is not all transitory.

Upon looking at the exhibits still more closely another advance can

be noted. Hitherto, with few exceptions, the display made by the Government has been fixed and motionless, like the collection in a museum. At Buffalo the proportion of "live" exhibits, of machinery in motion, of operations performed, is noticeably large. The aquarium of the Fish Commission has always been a feature of these exhibitions, and here it is more effective than ever. The South Annex is entirely devoted to the display of this bureau. Under the Department of Agriculture the process of meat inspection is shown by a group of young women, who, detailed from one of the packing houses, perform their regular work upon samples of suspected products. The coining press from the Mint is an old and familiar feature of these displays; and so, too, are the plate press of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the great revolving lenses of the Light-House Board.

Motion and activity are the characteristic features of the exhibit, and this fact is nowhere more forcibly illustrated than in the space assigned to the Department of the Interior. At Chicago, for instance, the Patent Office exhibited long lines of cases filled with motionless models, a collection which roused few visitors to enthusiasm. At Buffalo some models and some products are shown; but the space is mainly occupied by noteworthy inventions in full operation, doing the actual work for which they were devised. The telautograph, which transmits pictures by wire, the rival type-casting machines, and the voting machine may be mentioned as illustrations of the new policy. A live exhibit has replaced the dead one, and its greater significance is plain to everybody.

In methods of presentation the greatest novelty is offered by the Bureau of Education, which has heretofore been represented by "dead" exhibits of the least spectacular order. How could a subject like education be illustrated otherwise? This question was answered by invoking the help of the moving picture and the graphophone, which together show phases of education that could not be shown without their aid. Manual training, kindergarten exercises, gymnastics, the teaching of deaf mutes, and military drill are represented by moving pictures, while class-room work, such as songs and recitations, is reproduced by the graphophone. On the screen the naval cadets at Annapolis are seen to march, and the graphophone at the same time gives the music of the military band. Life and motion are brought before the eye, and the very sounds of the school-room are repeated to the ear. This is a new feature in exposition work, a new method of presentation which should be broadly applicable in the future. All manner of industrial activity

may be recorded on the moving film, and all sounds can be preserved upon the phonographic cylinder. At Paris, last year, moving pictures were used by some of the French colonies to show phases of life abroad, but the exhibit at Buffalo is a step onward in the same direction. A new field of possibilities has been opened.

It is not my aim to catalogue the Government Exhibit, nor is it desirable that I should record here too many of its details. It is enough to indicate thus briefly its essential character and purpose, and to bring out some of the points of difference between it and its predecessors. In nearly every department of it progress and improvement are manifested. May the advance continue in the future, and the next exhibition be better still.

F. W. CLARKE.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECENT TOUR.

SOME one has suggested the enactment of a law compelling the President of the United States to make an annual tour of the country whose destinies he directs. The intent of the suggestion is admirable; but never, let us hope, will a serious effort be made to carry it into execution. No one for a moment doubts the wisdom of the frequent appearance of the President and his Cabinet in every section of our broad domain; but these visits must be spontaneous in their inception. They must be the outcome of a genuine and patriotic desire to meet the people face to face; they must be born of love, and not of compulsion. And when a tour, thus inspired by a sincere interest in the nation's welfare, is characterized by a welcome of remarkable cordiality, the spectacle presented is worthy of philosophic consideration. Therefore, it seems to me, there are many lessons to be drawn from President McKinley's recent transcontinental journey, the discussion of which may not be without value to the readers of THE FORUM. The narrative side of the trip has been fully detailed in the columns of the daily press, while industrious and ubiquitous photographers have surfeited us with pictorial representations of each important event. I shall carefully avoid, as far as possible, both narration and description, confining myself to emphasizing those features of the tour which concern the broader phases of our national life.

The very first fact which, in my judgment, impressed itself upon the President and his party is the homogeneity of the American people. We reached San Francisco by way of Memphis, New Orleans, El Paso, and Los Angeles. The journey was over 3,000 miles in length; and yet there was no city *en route*, no crowd which gathered, which was not thoroughly and typically American. This, it may be remarked, was to have been expected; and yet the importance of the fact is not thereby lessened. I can now well understand why the weary brain-worker or the broken-down money-maker turns his face toward England and the Continent in his rest-seeking moments. A few hours from London and he is amid the kaleidoscopic scenes of Paris; thence Switzerland is within easy reach; Italy and Spain lie beyond; Germany and Russia, or even

Turkey and Egypt, are comparatively near at hand. Within a distance equal to that which separates New York and San Francisco, there are a dozen nationalities, each with its distinctive characteristics and each affording the delight of novelty. But the United States is the United States from ocean to ocean, from Canadian border to the blue waters of the Gulf of Mexico. The city which is reached to-day is but the counterpart of the city which was left yesterday. There is an unvarying monotony of architecture, an absolute lack of diversity in dress and custom. The people are actuated by the same ideas, they speak an identical language, they sell the same goods in stores modelled after the same pattern. Market Street in San Francisco is but a reproduction of Market Street in Philadelphia, even to the ferries at the lower end; and State Street in Chicago is but Broadway built up again with greater width.

Very trite and familiar all this may seem to the casual traveller who fails to appreciate its real significance; but it appealed to the President with tremendous force. He appreciated, more than ever, the solidity of the nation, its community of interest, the singleness of patriotic purpose which animates its great pulsating heart. As the statesman he is, he saw that as long as these conditions continue there is no need to question the future of the Republic. Thus we find him, in his speeches, impressing upon his auditors this idea of national unity. "One flag, one country, one destiny," was his unwavering text. It is no wonder that he found therein a theme for eloquent utterance. His words may seem empty rhetoric to the man whose view is bounded by the narrow confines of his own town or county, and to whom the word San Francisco conveys no idea of the vast expanse which separates that city from New York. To those who accompanied the President, and who witnessed everywhere hundreds of thousands of loyal citizens manifesting by every visible sign of pleasure their respect for the Presidential office and their personal regard for its occupant, the trans-continental tour was a continual inspiration. No man could have witnessed those scenes and remained unthrilled; no man could have participated in them without a feeling of pride in his American citizenship. What a contrast, for instance, with Austria-Hungary, where in a territory embracing only 240,000 square miles, as compared with the 3,500,000 square miles of the United States, we find such diversity of language that the printed money contains the denomination of the note expressed in more than a dozen different characters, and where the discussions of the Reichsrath may be likened to a modern Babel. Austria-Hungary is, indeed, a patchwork structure, liable to collapse; the United States is a complete, solidified, harmonious

edifice, with a foundation as broad and secure as the length and breadth of the land.

Such was the picture of the country as an entirety. Let me now present some views suggested by the sections of the country through which the President travelled. It is not as a discoverer that I chronicle the fact that conditions in the South are changing. I am well aware that every observer of national development has already made this truth plain. I mention it because it was impressed most emphatically upon those who accompanied the President, and was made the text for some of his most important deliverances. I have been through the South many times in the last decade, and remember, with special pleasure, the tour of the President two years or more ago, when he won the hearts of the Southern people by his loving reference to their soldier dead. Knowing the sentimental spirit of these people, I was prepared for the cordial greeting which they bestowed upon him in grateful appreciation of his kindly feeling; but, to my surprise, it was also the commercial instinct in the South which was largely responsible for the warmth of the welcome. In the typical Southern city of Vicksburg, where the fortifications of the Civil War still remain, their grim outlines now softened by grassy lawns, we saw an arch of cotton bales bearing the single word "Expansion." It was significant that in the city where this display occurred the reception of the President was most demonstrative in its nature. The arch and the welcome went together.

Vicksburg is a great cotton market. Englishmen, Germans, Italians, Frenchmen, and representatives of every other commercial nation under the sun reside there all the year, buying cotton and arranging for its shipment to foreign countries. The owners of the great cotton plantations know the value of these foreign markets. They know that they must go beyond the United States to find purchasers for their surplus stock. The war with Spain has opened to them the markets of the Orient. China and the Philippines have ceased to be mere names upon **the map, but are known to be the homes of millions of people who are clothed in products of the cotton loom.** Already the exports to China have vastly increased, Manchuria alone taking nearly \$10,000,000 worth of cotton goods last year.

The President realized that this commercial instinct, so long dormant in the South and now slowly awakening, needed but slight stimulation. It was for this reason that he told his Southern audiences that China is to have an open door, with advantages for the United States equal to those enjoyed by any other nation, and that in the far East there

is to be an unceasing demand for Southern cotton. His words met with a responsive echo, loud and long. When he talked of the great opportunities awaiting the American cotton planter, and emphasized the opening avenues of trade as a further incentive to industry and energy, he was cheered with a yell as ear-piercing as that which thrilled Pickett's men at Gettysburg. It may not be new blood in the veins of the Southern people, but it is blood which is coursing with new sensations. These Southerners are learning the value of the dollar. They are realizing that the practical business side of a question is to be preferred to the sentimental.

It is this development of commercialism which is honeycombing the political structure of the South. Senator McLaurin's utterances in South Carolina, and the still more recent speech of ex-Secretary Herbert before the Bar Association of Alabama, are not spasmodic outbursts. They are the logical sequences of new conditions in the South — conditions which have received a stimulus through the President's visit. It is quite natural, of course, that the politicians of the old school should deprecate the change; but it is doubtful whether they can withstand or even hinder it. There is a new element in Southern politics, the business element, and it seems disposed to act for itself in the future. The speeches of the President were an appeal to this element — an instance, in my opinion, of sowing seed in fertile ground.

Every mile of the President's trip through the South revealed the wonderful prosperity of that section. The cotton mills beside the railroad track in nearly every town along the route were monuments of commercial development; while the operatives, to whom a brief holiday had been given that they might see and cheer the President, were human documents of surpassing interest. It is to be noted, also, that the diversification of crops in the South, persistently urged for many years, has now become a realization. As we passed through the northern section of Alabama we were shown vast fields where corn has taken the place of cotton; where fertile valleys yield immense returns when planted with common and sweet potatoes; and where, upon far-reaching pasture lands, cattle were grazing. Truck farms, where strawberries of gigantic size and delicious sweetness are raised for early shipment to the North, are making money for their owners. Not only native Southerners but Northern immigrants have discovered that the land in this part, when properly tilled, will yield 500 bushels of sweet potatoes to the acre, and that the demand therefor is greater than the supply. They are learning, too, that the prosaic cabbage is worth money in the Northern market, and

that the sun-crowned hillside is admirably adapted to the culture of the grape. I want to add, while speaking of the South, that the Northern immigrant and the Southern native are dwelling together in peace and unity. The common interest of money-making is breaking down sectional barriers to a remarkable degree.

While interested, of course, in the South and in the Pacific Coast, the President anticipated with greatest eagerness his journey through Texas. He had never been in the State — so he remarked to me previous to his departure from Washington — and its immensity fascinated him. His speeches at Houston, Austin, San Antonio, and El Paso were evidences that his expectations had been fully realized. I am sure, however, that no just conception of the greatness of Texas can be formed unless its enormous distances are actually traversed. The President's train moved steadily westward for 1,200 miles, from the eastern border of the State to the western edge at El Paso, an extent of country exceeding the distance between New York and Chicago. It requires actual demonstration to appreciate the largeness of Texas. Stretch a bit of string upon a map, for instance, from Texarkana on the east to El Paso on the west, and then swing it around. The circle thus described extends into Minnesota on the north, and dips into the Atlantic Ocean upon the east, beyond the States of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida. To travel across Texas means to cover one-third of the continent from Charleston, South Carolina, to Los Angeles, California. The entire territory embraced in the New England States would be lost in the strip of Texas known as the Pan-handle. The county in which El Paso is situated is almost as large as Maine, and is larger than any other New England State.

The remarkable magnitude of Texas and the unlimited character of its natural resources did not fail to make a profound impression upon the President, whose speeches expressed his wonder and admiration. This was not surprising. A wall could be built around Texas, and the people thus enclosed could live upon their own products, independently of the rest of the world. Wheat from northern Texas, lumber from eastern Texas, cotton from central Texas, and wool and beef from the western and southwestern sections of the State, together with deposits of coal, iron, granite, and rock salt, would supply all necessary wants. The production of rice has become a great industry — the Southern Pacific railroad handled nearly a million bags last year — while the discovery of oil has created a sensation because of the marvellous quantity which gushes forth.

The President eulogized these wonderful resources, and praised, as they deserved to be praised, the generous hospitality and the genuine patriotism of the Texan people. He spoke in all sincerity; and it was gratifying to witness the pleasure produced by his earnest words. The Texan likes to be told that he lives in a great State. He looks forward to the time, apparently not far distant, when Texas will be the Empire State. Above all, he is anxious that the Eastern visitor shall observe that wealth and culture, refinement and intelligence, are not strangers within the Texas border. And they are not. There may still exist, in the innermost recesses of the State, the typical "bad man," with black flowing moustache and ever-ready pistol; but it is a slander upon Texas to place this character upon the stage as a representative of her citizenship. The reception given to Mrs. McKinley in the capitol at Austin brought together a gathering of fashionably dressed and beautiful women, whose presence would have graced any function in the East. And at El Paso, on the Mexican border, a banquet was served in admirable style, amid charming decorations, with the menu written in French. The Texan who knows his State may smile because I think it worth while to mention these details. I offer in extenuation my desire to enlighten some people whose ideas regarding this part of the country are still crude.

There can be no more impressive and convincing example of the faith and industry of the American people — the same sublime courage which enabled the Puritan and the Cavalier to carve an empire out of the wilderness on the Atlantic coast — than the oases where the desert lands of the United States have been transformed by irrigation. One effect of the President's trip will undoubtedly be to attract attention to this subject of irrigation. Its importance and value are not understood in the East. I remember, for instance, the spectacle of a United States Senator appealing to his colleagues, in the closing hours of a recent session of Congress, not to allow a small appropriation for the construction of irrigating reservoirs to be sacrificed in a conference between the two Houses upon an appropriation bill. He was unsuccessful. His fellow-Senators had no appreciation of the conditions which he presented to their consideration. The fact is that millions of dollars are annually squandered upon shallow creeks in the East, while meagre amounts are grudgingly allowed for a system which means the blossoming of desert lands in the arid region.

The President had ample opportunity to observe what has already been done by private capital. Phoenix, Arizona, is literally an oasis in

the desert; and where barrenness once reigned supreme, oranges, lemons, grape-fruit, and a luxuriance of flowers make southeastern California a paradise. It may well be asked why private enterprise cannot continue the work it has so energetically begun. The answer is simple and conclusive. The mountains where the melting snow should be stored for future delivery are generally far removed from the region where irrigation is needed, thus creating inter-State problems, while the immensity of the engineering projects demands national consideration. The time will come — and it will, undoubtedly, be hastened by the practical illustrations which came under the President's observation — when the now arid domain of the West will maintain many millions of souls. The soil is wonderfully responsive when touched by water, producing not only the finest fruits, but also alfalfa, the stock food of the West, and all manner of grain. In Wyoming a great tract is now being sown in wheat, and the harvest is absolutely certain, because the water, at present stored in an artificial lake, will be fed at regular intervals and in proper quantity to the growing grain, while the always shining sun will insure steady and perfect development. Thus are these arid plains being boldly seized by intrepid pioneers, and made to yield abundant return; and the Americans who have converted dry and barren sand into fields of living green deserve all the praise which the President bestowed upon them.

The President's progress through California was a continuous ovation. His pathway was literally strewn with roses, and all sorts and conditions of men and women united in doing him honor. It is not difficult to find the inspiration for this devotion. Upon the Pacific slope the President was something more than the official head of the nation, something more than a lovable man. He was the embodiment of an administration which has added the furthermost isles of the sea to our domain. San Francisco, more than any other city, has experienced practical benefit from expansion. It is the *entrepôt* of our commerce with the East. Its docks have been thronged with thousands of soldiers hastening to Manila, while incoming regiments have welcomed the outlines of the Golden Gate with unspeakable delight as the end of their homeward journey. The enormous cargoes of supplies for the Philippines and for the army in China have been broken in bulk in San Francisco, and the transfer from train to transport has given employment to labor. This is but the beginning. From this time on, the argosies that sail the Pacific will increase in number and value, and San Francisco will be the gainer thereby. Force of circumstances has made President McKinley the central figure in this development. In California, and especially in

San Francisco, a grateful and prosperous people made it evident that they regarded him as the mainspring of their enlarged destiny.

It was in San Francisco that a very remarkable result of the war with Spain was observed. Not so very long ago that city was almost unknown to the average Eastern man. It was separated from the East by a tedious and expensive railroad journey. The Pacific Coast was a section unto itself. Even now its merchants talk of "importing" goods "from the States." I remember seeing some years ago intimations that the people west of the Rocky Mountains were able and willing to exist independently of their Eastern brethren. The danger of a division of the Republic was, of course, more imaginary than real; but, in any event, it has been entirely removed by the acquisition of the Philippines. Across the continent during the past three years there has travelled a steady procession from East to West, most of the pilgrims bearing arms, it is true; but all of them active, patriotic, intelligent citizens. These Eastern men, who, but for the strange outcome of events, would never have known the Pacific Coast, have touched elbows with their brothers of the West, and both have gloried in a common country.

As I stood by the President on the broad parade ground of the Presidio and listened to his speech to the returned volunteers, it seemed to me that he had builded wiser than he knew when he guided the nation successfully through the momentous crisis of 1898. Not only had his sympathy and tact welded the North and the South, but he had brought the East and the West together with bands of common intercourse. It is no small thing that more Eastern people have visited San Francisco in the last three years than had travelled to the Coast in the previous two decades. The barriers have been broken down. Instead of being upon the outermost edge of the United States, San Francisco is now a stopping-place on the way to Manila, and to this extent, at least, is nearer New York than ever before. The people of the Pacific Coast realize and appreciate this fact. They favor, therefore, the permanent retention of our new possessions; and, viewed from their standpoint, expansion welds together the links in the chain of our national life.

The personal affection everywhere manifested for the President was remarkable. Crowds are always certain to assemble whenever a President appears in public. Curiosity explains their eager gathering; but no one who has travelled with President McKinley can have failed to observe that the popular esteem in which he is held is as much a personal as an official tribute. No President — certainly no President since the days of Lincoln — has been so close to the hearts of the people as

Mr. McKinley. I could instance a hundred incidents wherein this fact was demonstrated; but it is not necessary to adduce proof. I believe that few persons, even of the most partisan opposition, will dispute the universal personal popularity of the President. He has been blessed beyond measure in his Administration; but, more than this, the calcium light of publicity that surrounds him has revealed him as the highest type of American citizen, courteous, thoughtful, honest, Christian-like in his daily walk and conduct. It is because of his high and lovable character that the heart of the whole country beat in sympathy with him during the trying days of his wife's illness in San Francisco; and while this wellnigh tragic episode brought the trip to a hurried ending, it revealed the love of the American people for the man who, while an efficient and trusted Executive, was still more to be admired as a patient, loving husband. Unfortunate as it was that the finale of the tour had to be abandoned, the President must have found great consolation in the solicitude universally expressed; and the manifestation of this concern by the American people is by no means the most insignificant lesson of the President's trip. It shows that we still honor high ideals in our home life; that our hearts and consciences are not altogether hardened by the mad struggle for the accumulation of wealth.

It remains only to add that the President's train travelled about 7,000 miles, and that the entire journey was accomplished without delay or mishap. When it is remembered that this gratifying result was attained without the derangement of regular schedules, and that every detail of travel which forethought had suggested was executed without the slightest friction, it seems to me a notable demonstration of the excellence of American railway management. No wonder that the American railroad is to-day the envy and the admiration of the civilized world.

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST.

DEFECTS IN OUR PENSION SYSTEM.

In a speech on the army bill, delivered in the House of Representatives in February, 1901, Mr. McClellan of New York presented a table of figures showing what war means on its financial side. The appropriations for the regular expenses of maintaining our military establishment, as distinguished from those of an emergency character, amount to \$152,068,100 a year; the appropriations for the expenses fastened upon posterity by past wars — including the pension system, homes for disabled soldiers, national cemeteries, artificial limbs, and the like — amount to \$154,694,292; the total expenses of maintaining the naval establishment amount to \$80,056,135. The grand total of \$386,818,527 is striking enough in itself, but it becomes positively startling when we contrast it with the corresponding totals in each of the great Continental countries, and find the nearest approach to it in France, where the total war budget is only \$190,197,542, or less than half of ours. The largest item of appropriation in our whole list is for our pension system, which consumes, including the cost of maintaining the Bureau, very nearly \$150,000,000 a year.

One might naturally assume that the Government of the United States, acting as trustee for the people, would strictly scrutinize everything that is liable to increase the burdens of the Treasury. In the departments concerned wholly with active military administration it does this. No branches of our executive organism are protected by law with a nicer sense of the obligation of the custodian than the army and navy. The officer in either of these services who through carelessness loses sight of his accountability is subject to discipline; while he who deliberately proves false to his trust forfeits his commission and his livelihood, if indeed the magnitude of his offence does not land him in the penitentiary. Not a pound of hard tack or a pair of shoes can be sold to the War Department, for example, till the assurance exists that it will be needed, till the contractor has satisfied the authorities of his responsibility, and till the goods themselves have been inspected by experts. Not a dollar may be paid on either purchase till the vouchers have been

made out in a form designed to protect the Government against fraud as far as human precautions can do so, and until the auditing officers have gone over all the data and convinced themselves of the entire legality of the transaction. If, after furnishing the supplies, the contractor is so unfortunate as to trip on some unnoticed technicality, his account may be held up at the moment when he most needs the money, and his only recourse will be to the Court of Claims, where he must present his case as he would before any other tribunal, and where it will be decided in accordance with law and in pursuance of precedent. If he fails there, nobody can help him but Congress and the President, by the enactment of a private measure for his relief.

It will not be necessary to pause in this place to contrast the course of the military and naval establishments, charged with the duty of providing for our active war service, with the methods imposed by law upon the pension establishment, charged with liquidating most of our obligations surviving from past wars: the disparity will be obvious enough later. But there is another phase of this matter to which we should give a passing glance. Our pension system is the only form of life and casualty insurance in which the citizen is the insurer and the Government the underwriter. The citizen comes into this relation when he engages in what is regarded as an extra-hazardous employment, namely, that of fighting or resisting an armed enemy. If the Government were so disposed it might do with its soldiers somewhat as it does with its civil employees in fiduciary positions. It does not, in the case of these persons, write its own policies of indemnity. On the contrary, it says to the official trustee: "Find a bondsman for yourself. We reserve the right to reject him if unsatisfactory. Your compensation is made a trifle higher than that of your clerical colleagues or subordinates, so as to make up to you for the extra trouble and expense to which you may be put in procuring a bond; but every risk must fall upon your guarantor, and every premium he demands for taking this obligation upon himself must come out of your pocket and not from the Treasury."

Suppose it dealt in the same way with the soldier, requiring him to take out his own policy of insurance against death or accident, what would be the chance of his obtaining the stipend due him in case of disability, or of his family's receiving a corresponding consideration after his death? Taking for granted the solvency of the insurance company, the only question involved would be the perfection of the proofs adduced as to the insurer's death or disability. But these would have to be beyond reasonable doubt. Would the company obligingly throw open its books

and other records to the insurer's representatives, to facilitate their work in constructing a claim for him? Would it choose for its president a man who, on every question brought to him for decision, would inquire on which side the company's interest lay, and then scrupulously give judgment in favor of the other? Would it encourage its medical, inspecting, and auditing officers to pass every claim which was not on its face too outrageous, even if it depended for its support solely upon the evidence of persons of whom the company knew nothing, and whose credibility was not established? Would it station at the door of its vaults a servant to shout: "Come in and get your share. God help the surplus!" to every passer-by who wears any remnant of the federal uniform? I can safely leave these questions to be answered by anyone who knows the ways of the insurance world.

Thus far we have noticed only the business side of the case of the old soldier. It has also, and properly enough, a sentimental side. There are not a dozen taxpayers in the United States, I venture to say, who would raise any objection to providing at the public expense for the comfort of every man who has shed his blood for his country. I doubt whether even a service pension, if scrupulously guarded, honestly administered, and confined to the cases of the needy, would be unpopular. All that the people demand is that, in its desire to be kind to those who deserve kindness, the Government shall not become indiscriminate and let in the undeserving as well, and that liberality shall not be construed to mean prodigality and riot. For every bad claim admitted some good claim suffers indirectly. It is, therefore, of great importance that the pension roll should be watched, not only by special agents employed in the public service, but by all good citizens, and that every facility should be offered to persons whose aim is to save the Government from being imposed upon. But what do we find to be the case?

Mr. Smith, an old and respected resident of Blank, Ohio, hears a rumor that one James Jones, a neighbor, is soon to receive a pension from the Government. Feeling doubtful whether Jones has ever rendered the service required by law, or suffered such injuries as would make him a proper object of benevolence, Mr. Smith appears at the Pension Bureau one day with a request that he be permitted to look over Jones's papers on file there. "Are you James Jones?" he is asked. He answers in the negative. "Do you represent him as an attorney?" Again a negative answer. "Then we cannot accommodate you. The law does not authorize us to submit the papers of applicants to public inspection."

As the old gentleman is turning away disgusted, a beardless youth

enters and fills out a blank calling for the papers of James Jones. A messenger carries away the requisition, and the papers are speedily brought to him. Mr. Smith looks on in wonder. He knows that the young man is not Jones, so he asks him, to satisfy his own curiosity: "Are you Mr. Jones's attorney?" "No, he lives at Blank, Ohio. My employer is William Robinson, pension solicitor, here in Washington. Mr. Jones's attorney sends his cases to Mr. Robinson, who turns them over to me to attend to." "Then you are the clerk of the attorney who is retained by the attorney who is retained by Mr. Jones?" "That's it." "And you are here to correct some error in Jones's record?" "Oh, dear, no. I am looking over his papers to see what more is needed to procure him a pension."

Is it wonderful that Mr. Smith goes away with his mind in a state of confusion? In all his previous dealings in business he has observed that when one man is trying to get another man's money, the latter neither aids the enterprise himself nor allows any of his subordinates to do so. Indeed, Mr. Smith may have observed that, as a rule, the Government, too, guards every door through which one of its own servants, or a contractor, or a claimant can get access to the cash in its vaults. Yet, in this one exception of the pension system, the man who is trying to squeeze money out of the treasury may come himself, or send his attorney, or his attorney's attorney, or even his attorney's attorney's clerk, and get all the information he needs; whereas the man who would like to save the Government from robbery is not permitted to look at papers which may contain half a dozen forgeries he could detect single-handed.

This illustration is only typical of the first of two exceedingly bad features of our pension laws. It shows what Commissioner Evans meant when, with cynical humor, he said that he had given four years of the best efforts of his life toward "having this Government get control of its pensioning system." For many years it has not been the Government that has had control, but persons who make a business of working against the Government. There are now probably 50,000 men in the United States — a pretty fair-sized army — who draw their livelihood largely from procuring pensions. They include solicitors, claim agents, and a class of touters, or pullers-in, as they would be called in an old-clothes district. There are also travelling men — "drummers" for commercial houses furnishing the model. The whole lot are dignified with the title of attorney, whereas comparatively few have any knowledge of law. Some of those in country places caught the knack of a few simple forms

in legal procedure by serving as justices of the peace. A considerable percentage, especially in Washington, consists of graduates of the Pension Bureau. When the so-called Dependent Pension Act of 1890 went into operation, dozens of clerks quitted the Bureau to set themselves up in practice as solicitors of claims. The new law was so invitingly broad in its scope, the requirements it imposed upon the claimants were so insignificant as compared with those imposed in any court or under any law for the adjudication of one citizen's private claims against another, that they felt justified in giving up a fair stated salary for a big prospect in fees. However well or ill educated in the science of law, they were adepts in their own branch of practice. They knew all the weak spots in the frail wall of defence with which the Government has surrounded itself; they had learned the soft places in the human nature even of bureau chiefs and heads of divisions; they had mastered every word and phrase which they knew to have proved attractive in presenting the claims which it had formerly been their business to handle, and they had a full appreciation of the value of certain technicalities. The practice in the office was an old story with them. They realized how inadequate was the supervision of evidence, how easily a *prima facie* case could be established under the law, and how few cases needed to be carefully prepared.

In short, these men had enjoyed great opportunities for the study of their calling while as clerks they were allowing hundreds of claims between nine o'clock in the morning and four in the afternoon. Not a few of the old hands still in the service remember well when a certain Commissioner gave orders that the Bureau should "make a record" of admitting 1,000 claims a day. This was while the Commissioner himself was borrowing money for his private speculations from one of the attorneys who practised before him, and who is understood to have collected more than \$500,000 in one year, in fees deducted from pensioners' first payments! That was a golden harvest period in the claims business in Washington, when, within three years, more than half a million names were added to the roll of pensioners. Young men were stimulated by such figures to forsake other callings and become solicitors; and, as the multitude of solicitors increased, of course it became necessary to increase correspondingly the multitude of claimants — artificially, if in no natural way — in order to make business enough to go around.

The other notably weak feature in the existing system is that of the medical examination. The medical examiners are grouped in boards of three members, who do their work at the county seats at or nearest

their own homes. They are now paid by fees, receiving \$2 apiece for each examination, so that every claimant, at the outset of his career, costs the Government \$6. It is true that no examination is held except upon the Commissioner's order; but he must give the benefit of the doubt to the applicant in every instance where a *prima facie* case is made out. The method of choosing and appointing medical examiners is slipshod, to say the least. They are recommended to the Commissioner by Senators and Representatives who are often quite unacquainted with their personal traits or professional acquirements, indorsing them at the instance of local petitioners, usually members of the Grand Army of the Republic. Surgeons thus procured may be good, bad, or indifferent.

In 1875, Commissioner Atkinson drew attention to this evil. Of the medical examiners employed during that year, five had been removed for incompetency, and seventy for other causes, principally for neglect of duty, while forty-nine had resigned, a part of them doubtless to avoid removal. A large percentage of the certificates sent to the Bureau at Washington by these examiners had to be returned to them for correction; the defect in most cases being the lack of an intelligent and particular description of the disability found. Though a surgeon may be thoroughly competent to make examinations, it is only after he has gained a practical knowledge of the requirements of the Bureau that he is able to describe the condition of applicants in the manner necessary for a proper adjudication of their claims. Any conscientious Commissioner would be glad to get men of high professional standing for these medical places; but, with no means for testing their qualifications for appointment, the incompetent are liable to be forced upon him side by side with the competent.

It not infrequently happens that the claim agents themselves take a hand in procuring such appointments. They circulate petitions and obtain signatures without difficulty from a host of outside persons who, if they give the subject any thought at all, assume that any surgeon can do such work as the Pension Bureau demands. Many of the signatures undoubtedly come from intending claimants; and thus the surgeon's integrity of purpose is handicapped from the start by the fact that he owes his appointment in part to a group of men who will soon be brought before him for examination, and to the activity of an attorney who has many fees to gain if their claims go through successfully.

Even a surgeon with the best of intentions may make a failure of his work as a medical examiner: (1) by allowing his sympathies to be

unduly moved by cases which appear pitiful, forgetting for the moment that his employer is the Government and not the claimant; (2) by the circumstance that he is dependent for his practice upon the community in which he does his work for the Government, and finds it hard to resist the sentiment of the neighborhood or the urgency of the member of Congress directly responsible for his appointment; and (3) by letting his inexperience or carelessness so affect his report that it must pass backward and forward through the mails several times in process of correction. Every time a report enters the Bureau it has to await its order for examination; and if it must be returned, amended, and forwarded a second or a third time, the delays are often distressing to the claimant and obstructive to the machinery of the Bureau.

The way some medical examiners work has given them at headquarters the nickname of "specialists." To an outsider it is comical to see three professional men appearing to go mad over a particular disease. With one board every claimant examined will be found to have chronic diarrhoea; with another, disordered liver; with a third, rheumatism, or some other complaint of which the symptoms are more or less indefinite. The medical division of the Bureau recently found that, out of thirty-two examinations made by one board in one week, all the claimants were described as having organic heart disease — twenty-six of them had a systolic murmur of the heart, and six a diastolic murmur. This coincidence seemed so improbable that twelve of the claimants were ordered to a second examination, but before a medical board in the next county. The medical referee, an ex-Union soldier and medal-of-honor man, went on from Washington to witness this test. The second board was not advised as to what disabilities the first had found, but was instructed simply to make a thorough examination, and ascertain the exact condition of each claimant. Heart disease was not found to exist in a single instance. For further assurance, the referee — who, besides his other experience, had served seventeen years as a medical examiner himself — made a separate examination of each of the twelve cases, and confirmed the report of the board that heart disease was not present in one.

In view of the ease with which any person may become a pension attorney, and of the hap-hazard methods pursued in the selection of medical examiners, it is plain that the Government has to trust more to good luck than to anything else to save itself from being continually cheated. One perennial source of danger is the *ex parte* character of nearly all proceedings in pension cases; the Government having no opportunity to know or to cross-question either the principal in a case or

his witnesses. Even the identification of the principal, when he is ordered before the medical examiners, is so incompletely protected as to be farcical. An attorney fills out the necessary form of application, procures the attesting signatures required, and forwards the document to Washington. If he has made up a fair-looking case the Commissioner mails two orders: a red order, so-called from the color of the paper on which it is printed, goes to the local medical board, directing it to examine A. B. when he appears before it; and a white order is sent to the applicant, directing him to appear before the board.

The man who presents himself with a white order in his hand is examined by the board. He may be A. B., in whose name the order is made out, or he may be C. D., who never saw a day's military service, but whose system is saturated with diseases, and whom A. B., or his attorney, has therefore hired for an impersonation. The report of the board will be made ostensibly on A. B.'s case, but actually on C. D.'s, and quite innocently, the members having no legal means of compelling the man to identify himself in a satisfactory manner, and no reason to suspect the substitution. A similar fraud is possible when witnesses from outside are procured to testify to their remembrance of the claimant, of his service in the army, and of the things which happened to him there. The Government sees nothing but the names signed to the affidavits. In nineteen cases out of twenty, these affidavits have been written by the attorney and sent to the witnesses to sign; and investigation has proved that many a witness swears to such papers from motives of pity for a needy old soldier, but with only the vaguest recollection of the incidents described, or no recollection at all — nay, without so much as reading what stands before his name.

What is the result of these fast-and-loose practices on both the legal and the medical sides of the pension system? The criminal records of the Bureau tell some interesting tales. For instance, one attorney in Charleston, South Carolina, who was also a notary public, found it more profitable to execute affidavits than to represent his clients before the Pension Bureau; because, whether a case succeeded or failed, he could always make his notarial fees, whereas, as an attorney, he would get nothing if a claim were rejected. He was associated with another notary, who was also a barber. He would himself execute the papers in cases which he believed safe, but those which he found it necessary to accompany with dangerous forgeries he would turn over to his barber notary, who would execute them in large batches every Monday morning. This attorney forged hundreds of papers, filing claims in the names of dead

persons, and giving fictitious addresses to the Pension Bureau so as to be able to control the mail matter sent out from there.

Of 105 claims filed by a Tennessee attorney, only eight were found, on investigation, of sufficient merit to have passed the Bureau if properly prepared; the rest were wholly fictitious, or based on forged papers. He pleaded insanity when brought to the bar.

Another attorney, living in Indiana, locally a most respected member of society and the superintendent of a Sunday school, based most of his frauds upon what he was pleased to consider his duty as a Christian and a benevolent man. For example, when his partner fell ill, he conceived the idea that it would be a graceful act to procure a pension for the invalid, and accordingly forged the papers necessary to that end. When confronted with hundreds of forgeries of this sort, he cheerfully admitted them, resting his defence on the excellence of his motive, and assuring his prosecutor that everybody whose name he forged "would have been perfectly willing, if alive and present, to have sworn to the same statements."

An attorney at Providence, Rhode Island, induced several of his clients to put their certificates into his hands and let him collect the money for them. Whenever a client died, the attorney concealed the fact, changed the man's address at the Pension Bureau to some other place, and went there and obtained the letters. The vouchers, of course, he had to forge; but that was simple. In one case he rented a box in a country post-office and had the mail of two of his dead clients sent there. He had about twenty of these ghastly tricks in operation when he was apprehended; and the exposure inspired the Postmaster-General to issue immediately a rigid rule requiring the delivery of pension letters thereafter only to the pensioner in person, or to some member of his family designated by him.

A soldier who formerly lived in Brooklyn, New York, and who had served honorably and been wounded in battle, filed an application for a pension on the ground of hernia, and appeared before two separate notaries in Brooklyn, impersonating comrades who had served in the same company with him, concocting fictitious addresses for them, and testifying in their name to the date and cause of his own disability. Later he committed a similar offence at seven different points in the United States, and the testimony thus forged in his own behalf filled twenty-three documents. The ingenuity he displayed in this series of frauds was notable. In one case, which threatened to be troublesome, he went so far as to rent a house in a comrade's name and take a lock-

box in the post-office, so that landlord and postmaster would both attest his credibility.

A rascal is moving about the country, uncaptured up to the present writing, whose specialty is impersonating witnesses. The curious feature of this case is his success in deceiving honest claimants. He will obtain from one victim the name of another veteran in a town near by, will go to him and represent himself as an ex-comrade, and offer to go upon his papers, charging, of course, so much for each affidavit. From this one in turn he ascertains the address of another member of the same company living elsewhere, repeats the operation there, and so on indefinitely.

Such examples of the utter inadequacy of the present system to protect the Government against fraud on its legal side are matched by cases cropping out continually in the medical branch of the business. A man drawing a large pension on the strength of the certificate of a medical examining board that he was totally deaf was discovered in charge of a telephone instrument, through which he was receiving and transmitting messages without difficulty. One pensioned for total blindness was found reading newspapers and doing cabinet work; another blind man was encountered in a jewelry shop, engaged in delicate mechanical tasks with a magnifying-glass stuck in his eye. A man drawing \$72 a month because of his "total inability to perform any kind of manual, professional, or skilled labor," and because he "required the regular aid and attendance of another person," was discovered one day industriously painting the side of a four-story warehouse, having drawn himself up on a twenty-foot ladder, handling both the ropes without any assistance. Another \$72 pensioner, "totally disabled" like the house-painter, was met by a special agent walking down the street with a lawn-mower over his shoulder, carrying it as easily as most men carry a fowling-piece. He was subjected to reexamination, and the doctors could find him suffering from nothing but the habitual use of opium. A pensioner who is drawing \$50 a month, because, owing to an injury to his hip, he cannot lean over far enough to tie his shoe-strings, is to-day engaged in a clerical occupation at a good salary within a stone's throw of where these lines are written. But why continue this endless catalogue?

Is there any way of changing the laws so as to make such things impossible? Impossible — no; vastly less frequent — yes. As long as human nature remains what it is frauds will occur. What can be done, however, is to make crime more difficult. The most intelligent officers of the Pension Bureau believe that a number of competent medical men

could be drawn into the service by salaries sufficient to pay them fairly for their time, and by some guarantee of permanent tenure; that the present system of fixed local boards of examiners should be abolished, and roving boards established in their stead, each consisting of two good surgeons, a reputable and well-educated lawyer, and a stenographer; and that such boards should be required to travel from county seat to county seat in the several States, having published in advance a notice of the days when they will sit at a certain place and hold examinations. Their sessions should be in the court house of the county town, and they should visit one place not oftener than twice a year.

If they met in this way and in so public a resort, the chances of imposition through substitution or other fraud would be reduced to a minimum. The surgeons, by being made independent of local influences, would be relieved of one cause of bias which embarrasses them now. As they would keep at their work continuously, they would acquire such skill in making their returns that their papers would always expedite rather than retard the adjudication of claims. The lawyer on the board would have an opportunity not only to question, but to cross-question, each applicant and all witnesses giving evidence in person; and the stenographer would take down the questions and answers, medical and otherwise, for preservation in the Government records, should the same cases ever come up again in any form. Last, but not least, the saving to both Government and applicant would be very large; the applicant having no use for an attorney when the Government undertakes to do everything for him, and the Government obtaining professional skill and time-saving experience for a fair salary, in the place of inefficiency and delays under an extravagant fee system.

It must not be assumed, because popular attention has been called in a marked manner of late to the shortcomings of existing methods, that the complaints are in any sense new. The protests of honest and plain-speaking Commissioners of Pensions began at least as far back as 1872, when Commissioner Baker, appointed by President Grant — surely no foe to the Union soldier — passed some very severe comments on the frauds discovered in both the invalid and the widows' and dependents' branches of this work. His warnings were echoed by several of his successors; and now, when the number of claims adjudicated in a year has reached some 225,000, almost every adjudication being on *ex parte* evidence exclusively, it seems as if the acme of wrongful possibilities had been reached.

Albeit Congress has been pressed for nearly thirty years on this sub-

ject, no relief is yet forthcoming. The influence of the attorneys and claim agents appears to be as large under the dome of the Capitol as their legal privileges are under the gables of the Pension Bureau. Whenever a Commissioner attempts to effect some reforms without additional legislation, he is promptly frowned down. To this day the Bureau has its dockets loaded with claims of "minors" who have now grown to be middle-aged or elderly men. It is obvious that the framers of the law providing for this class had in view the temporary maintenance of helpless children, too young to work and yet a drain upon the resources of a widowed mother or other relative. There was probably no thought of furnishing big arrears to men who have got well along in life without any assistance, and who simply come back upon the Government for money, because the treasury happens to be full and everyone is free to get what he can out of it. If a Commissioner, however, occasionally makes bold to return to the original purpose of the law in his decision of a case, his temerity is rebuked in a most disagreeable fashion, and an appeal is carried through over his head.

In those rare cases, by the way, where an appeal does not follow the refusal of any claim which has a single technical leg left to stand on, the cause must be sought elsewhere than in the claimant's modesty or in his satisfaction with the result. For example, under the law of June 27, 1890, it is not necessary for a widow to show that the death of her soldier husband was caused even remotely by his army service. She has merely to prove that he served at least ninety days and was honorably discharged, that she was married to him prior to the enactment of the law, and that she is without other means of support than her own labor and a net annual income not exceeding \$250. In the adjudication of claims under this act, widows have in more than one instance been discovered to have been accessories before the fact in the murder of their husbands. All the conditions fixed by the statute were fulfilled, but the Bureau has rejected these claims on the ground that the law-making power never contemplated that a woman should create her own pensionable status by killing a soldier. For reasons which may suggest themselves to the reader, no appeal has been brought in any of these cases.

On the other hand, in one instance within the knowledge of the writer, a Commissioner attempted to stem the tide of governmental folly by a decision based not upon the law, but upon good morals. The case was that of a woman who claimed a pension under the act of 1888, running back to the date of her husband's death. On investigation it was

found that the husband had enlisted for the civil war, and that the wife had taken the companionship of another man within two weeks of his departure. At the end of his term, the husband died within ten days of mustering-out, the wife never having in the mean time returned to her duty or even forsaken her lawless ways. Technically, not having married the second man, this woman was the first one's widow, and therefore within the privileged circle established by statute. The Commissioner indorsed upon the back of her file of papers: "Application refused on grounds of public policy." His decision was overruled on appeal.

This fact and others which might be cited go to show that the Pension Bureau, as conducted under the present administration and some of its predecessors, has been no willing party to the degeneration of the pension list from a pure roll of honor to a mixed catalogue. The blame must rest on Congress and on the clamorous army of claim agents and solicitors who infest the lobbies of that body. To no small extent, moreover, the boldness of the claim agents in making war upon any Commissioner who tries to do his duty, and the inactivity of Congress when reforms are most urgently needed, are traceable to the apparent indifference of good citizens at large. If these were as aggressive in supporting an honest officer as men of the other sort are in assailing him, and if they would insist upon decent pension legislation with half the energy they put into a demand for a tariff schedule or a currency measure, the honest pensioner would soon have cause for pride in his certificate, wholesale perjury would go to a discount, the taxpayers would take fresh heart of hope, and the legacies of an American war now thirty-six years past would cease to be a gaping-stock for the civilized world.

FRANCIS E. LEUPP.

STATISTICAL BLUNDERS.

AN epigram attributed to a well-known statistician runs: "Figures won't lie, but fools and liars will figure." This saying well sums up the misuse of statistics. There are both persons who intentionally misuse and misrepresent statistics for their own ends, and those also who misuse them through mere ignorance or carelessness. Statistics are like a sharp knife, a very efficient tool in skilful, honest hands, but a dangerous weapon in the hands of the unskilful or vicious. We do not condemn the knife because, whether through the ignorance or the design of the man who holds it, it creates mischief. Of the two classes, the ignorant and the vicious, the former are the more dangerous, mainly because they are the more numerous. The great and constantly increasing interest in statistics and in the knowledge derived from them has resulted in drawing into this field an army of writers many of whom are unskilled in the use of their tools. This fact has served to discredit statistics and statistical methods of research. We often find in magazines, and even in more permanent forms of literature, the most startling conclusions drawn from an array of figures, the value and meaning of which are entirely misconceived.

Some years ago, a fever of apprehension seized many people through their fear of negro domination in this country. It had been discovered that, on the face of the census returns, negroes had increased more rapidly than whites between 1870 and 1880. The fact is that long before the publication of the figures of the race in 1880 it had been shown conclusively that the census of 1870 was deficient, and that this deficiency was mainly in the enumeration of negroes in the South. Disregarding this discovery, although it had been widely circulated, and ignoring the previous history of the race, which should have led to the opposite conclusion, alarmists rushed into print with the most direful predictions. Books were written on the subject, and the newspapers were filled with it. The amount of trouble and worry which this stupid, careless blunder caused our people is simply incalculable. It took a deal of hard

hammering by those who understood the facts to disabuse the public mind, and even yet one occasionally meets relics of this error.

There is a general belief in the exceptionally great age of negroes. The census age tables are in great part responsible for this, as they show several times as many centenarians among negroes as among whites. Now the fact is that the negro is short-lived. It is doubtful if one ever lived for a century; certainly very few of them have lived for 90 years. Their death rate is nearly double that of whites. The census tables give the ages of people as they are reported to the enumerators; and, as many people do not know their ages, and therefore give them incorrectly, it follows that there must be a large percentage of error. Especially is this true of negroes, and doubly so of aged negroes, who are very prone to exaggerate their ages. The whites, particularly the most highly civilized whites, are the longest-lived people on earth.

Statistics of mortality have always been a fruitful field for the blunderer, who again falls back upon the ill-used census as his source of inspiration. The mortality statistics of the census are derived from two sources: (1) The enumerators' returns, which are obtained in all parts of the country; and (2) the registration returns, obtained from such States and cities as maintain a registration of deaths. The first are everywhere incomplete; the second are fairly complete in some States and cities, but incomplete in others. Accordingly, the enumerators' returns show a death rate far below the rates of most other civilized countries. In that fact the blunderer glories. They show a death rate of negroes but slightly greater than that of whites. This alarms him, for he reasons that the negroes, with their excessive birth rate, must be greatly increasing in number. The returns show inconsistencies in the adult and infantile death rates and in the death rate from various diseases, and the conclusions drawn from them are surprising.

It is the same old story. A little study of the introduction to the statistics of mortality in the census reports would have taught that the figures are confessedly incomplete; that the omissions of deaths are greater in the South than in the North, greater among negroes than among whites, greater among children than among adults, and consequently greater in diseases of children than in those of adults; in short, that the statistics derived from enumerators' returns are wellnigh worthless for all purposes except to prove their own worthlessness.

Turning now to the States and cities where registration is maintained, we find many of them claiming unusually low death rates and arguing therefrom the superior healthfulness of the climate, the water

supply, etc. One of the States of this Union claimed in 1880 a death rate of but 16 per 1,000 per year. The annual death rate of the United States as a whole is probably between 18 and 19 per 1,000; that of the rural districts being slightly lower, and that of the large cities slightly higher, than these figures. A death rate of 16 per 1,000 was therefore very favorable, and indicated the existence of especially healthful conditions. The State was not satisfied, however, with this excellent showing, and created a Board of Health, which did its work so thoroughly that in 1885 the death rate was reduced to 4.5 per 1,000, and in 1890 to but 4 per 1,000. It is true that an ill-natured, critical person might say that these results were achieved by the omission of three-fourths of the deaths, and that the Board of Health, instead of receiving commendation in the Governor's messages, as it did repeatedly, should have been discharged for incapacity. It may be added, in support of this criticism, that the registration returns from that State were condemned as untrustworthy by the United States census of 1890.

The registration returns of the larger cities show similar phenomena. In 1899 the death rates of 136 of our largest cities were published. Of these cities, 23 claimed to have death rates of less than 10 per 1,000; in 65 of them the rate was said to be between 10 and 15 per 1,000; in 43 of them, between 15 and 20 per 1,000; and only 5 cities confessed to a rate exceeding 20 per 1,000. A death rate below 18 in a large city is surprising; if much below, it should arouse suspicion; while the publication of a death rate below 10 is an insult to the intelligence of the public. Probably not one of the cities referred to had a death rate of less than 18 per 1,000, although five-sixths of them reported rates below that figure. There are two methods of obtaining a low death rate: one is to enumerate only a part of the deaths; the other, to estimate the population at too high a figure. When these methods are used conjointly the result is remarkably effective.

Other common fallacies concern our mental, moral, and physical progress. It is believed by many who ought to know better, and is taught by alarmists, that insanity, deafness, blindness, and crime are rapidly increasing, and that we shall soon become a nation of defectives and criminals. Census statistics are quoted in support of this prediction. There is no question but that all these things were indicated on the face of the earlier census returns, and it is equally certain that as a matter of fact none of them is true. Insanity, deafness, blindness, and criminality are not on the increase in our country. It is true that the reports up to 1880 showed a much larger proportion of insane, deaf,

and blind among the population at each succeeding census. But why? Simply because we were able at each succeeding period to obtain a fuller enumeration of these classes, and thus to make a closer approach to the actual facts. Half a century ago defective persons were kept at home, and their deficiencies were scrupulously concealed from public view. In these later days, they are placed in asylums and special schools, and consequently are enumerated and classified in a much larger proportion of cases. The census of 1890 shows a smaller proportion of these defective classes than did the census of 1880, and no doubt represents the true situation.

The explanation of incorrect conclusions regarding criminals is different. The number of criminals depends in great measure upon what the law defines as crimes, and upon the degree of efficiency in the administration of justice. Taking the country as a whole, there are many more statutory crimes than a century or half a century ago. Misdemeanors which now send a man to jail were in former times winked at. On the basis of the number of commitments to jail comparisons have been made in print between the moral condition of Massachusetts and Mississippi, to the disadvantage of the former State. The writer ignored or forgot the differences in the laws of the two States, and the variations in the degree of efficiency with which those laws are enforced. It is probable that a greater number of arrests means a higher, rather than a lower, condition of morals. A recent writer argued that the Northern negroes were much more criminally disposed than were those of the South; basing his argument similarly upon the number of commitments for crime, and thus falling into the same error.

The ten-year period, which in most of our States separates two consecutive enumerations of the people, affords opportunities and temptations to overestimate the population, especially that of growing, progressive cities. The bases of these estimates are variously selected, being in some cases a census of school children, in others the number of names given in the city directory, in others the number of voters registered or the number of votes cast; the total number in each case being multiplied by a number representing the supposed relation of the particular class to the population. There is no harm in this amusement in itself; but when results obtained by such doubtful methods are dignified by the name of statistics, when death rates are based upon them, when the figures of the census even are called in question because they disagree with them, it seems desirable to characterize them properly. In 118 of our large cities the population as thus estimated exceeds the true popu-

lation in 74 cases, and falls short of it in 44. In one case the excess was not less than 60 per cent. of the true population.

In all such estimates there is an element of the greatest uncertainty, namely, the proportion which the section enumerated bears to the whole number of inhabitants. It is well understood that there are great variations at different elections in the number of voters registered and the number of votes cast; so that to assume in any particular election that the voters constitute a certain percentage of the population would be extremely unsafe. It would be safer to guess at the population directly than to guess at this element of the calculation. A directory is very elastic in its number of names, and, by proper manipulation in the hands of an enthusiastic compiler, can be made to indicate almost anything desired in the way of population.

HENRY GANNETT.

THE AMERICAN WORKMAN'S "GOLDEN AGE."

A CERTAIN popular conviction of the day ascribes to the condition of the workman, urban or rural, a constant deterioration. His wages are held to be declining, and his comforts lessening; his security of employment is declared to be less stable, and his economic freedom to be disappearing. Growing out of this conviction has arisen the notion of a sort of Golden Age somewhere back in the early days of the Republic — an age when the workers of town and country enjoyed a life of almost idyllic comfort and independence. Occasionally, indeed, a variation of this view is shown: the worker admittedly receives more wages than his mid-century or earlier predecessor; but it is held that his employment is less regular and his freedom more curtailed, and that he has failed to share in the enormous growth of the general wealth. This latter view, however, is not popular with the radicals, since it admits too much.

It is hard to determine upon what historical or statistical basis is built this notion of a golden age and of the laborer's deterioration. Certain European travellers of the early days, who commented upon the comfort of the American masses, may be quoted somewhat in its favor; but, on the other hand, consideration must be taken of the contemporary state of the English, Irish, and French masses with which the condition of the Americans was compared. The extreme of hardships suffered at various times in this country never reached so low a plane as the extreme suffered by the English peasantry during the years following the Napoleonic wars. An English traveller visiting this country at that time, even had he seen the New Hampshire farmers living on bean porridge, or heard the thousands of unemployed men in the cities clamoring for work, would yet have been forced to admit the superior comfort of the American masses. M. Levasseur, in his recent volume, "The American Workman," quotes Michel Chevalier, the economist, who visited this country in 1835, as saying: "Here the laboring class feels its power, and combination is open." But at that time combination was prohibited in France; and, moreover, it was just at

that time that the Equal Rights party of the city of New York was waging a political agitation, and that a number of strong trade-unions came into existence throughout the country. The contrast between France and America was for the moment extreme. Two years later this situation had changed entirely. Judgments of this nature are always relative; Arthur Young, it will be remembered, at a time (1788-90) when the English peasantry were in a deplorable state, congratulated his country that it could show no such scenes of misery as he witnessed in Savoy and Brittany.

The mass of testimony, from the time of Yorktown to that of Bull Run, tells a story of anything but a golden age for the American workman. It tells, on the other hand, the narrative of a nation built up by hard work, resolutely performed under the keenest privations. It tells of the growth of a gigantic national wealth, and the heaping up of immense fortunes; but at the same time it reveals the earlier condition of the common workman, the mechanic, the farm laborer, often even the farmer, as generally one of pathetic destitution, the maximum of comfort being found toward the end of the century and the minimum toward the beginning. Not even in the worst days since the Civil War — in 1873, for instance — have conditions been as bitter as they were in some of the earlier periods; and no one could write of any of the recent years of average prosperity such a tale as Horace Greeley wrote of the "good years" of 1831-32.

Let it be said plainly, however, that though this view be granted — that a wider diffusion of comfort has prevailed since the Civil War than in any other period of thirty-five years — there is yet no room for complacent satisfaction with the present condition of the masses. Whatever the degree of betterment, there is yet infinite opportunity for progress. He who looks about him sympathetically cannot fail to see innumerable instances of social ills, shocking alike to Christian morals and to secular ethics; nor can he help echoing, when the full import of what he sees is borne in upon him, the dictum of Huxley, that if no marked improvement is to come it were best that some friendly comet should sweep the planet to destruction. The point sought to be established here is not that the present condition of the workers is satisfactory or even tolerable, but that poverty was more intense and general, and that complaint was more bitter, in the earlier than they have been in the later days. The point is a most important one in sociology; for, if true, it overturns the Marxian notion of an ideal society destined to arise out of the progressive deprivation and brutalization of the workers,

and shows instead a progressive, though irregular, betterment, the goal of which no man can foresee.

The Revolution ended with the larger part of the population impoverished. What wealth there was lay mostly in the hands of a few score men. The disparity of condition between a laborer and a Charles Carroll or a George Washington was probably greater than exists to-day between a laborer and a Carnegie. Employment was scarce; the circulating medium fluctuated in value; the workman had no security for his pay, and was frequently defrauded. Wages were paid quarterly, semi-annually, or annually. If the workman bought goods on credit, the debtor's prison yawned for him; and, if he was imprisoned, his food and comforts had to be supplied by private charity. "In 1784," says John Bach McMaster, "the houses of the working-people were meaner, their food was coarser, their clothing was of commoner stuff, and their wages were, despite the depreciation that has gone on in the value of money, lower by one-half than at present." Socially the laborer was a nonentity. "There was an aristocracy and a democracy," writes a post-Revolutionary author, "whose limits were as clearly marked by manner and dress as by legal enactment." Politically the laborer was powerless, for the franchise was generally denied him. In New York State it was not until forty-one years after Yorktown that he could vote, and in Rhode Island not until one hundred and five years thereafter. Dr. John W. Francis, a post-Revolutionary writer, quoted by Mr. Myers in his "*History of Tammany Hall*," describes the "upper class" in New York as "sneering at the demand for political equality made by the leather-breeched mechanic with his few shillings a day."

One of the most significant glimpses of the general post-Revolutionary conditions is given in the frequent recognition, in contemporary literature, of the existence of a class of working poor who were often fed by private charity. A popular cook-book, the third edition of which was published in Exeter, New Hampshire, in 1808, devotes several paragraphs to the subject of the preparation of food for the worthy poor. The cook is charged to save all useful scraps and left-over food that they may be made into soup and other dishes for charitable use. "What a relief," the authoress concludes, "to the laboring husband, instead of bread and cheese, to have a comfortable meal!" Labor organizations had hardly begun, though occasional strikes, such as those of the Philadelphia shoemakers in 1796, 1798, and 1799, showed the spirit of revolt against hard conditions. The small farmers and the farm laborers had a yet more grievous time of it; and though Shays's Rebellion

(1786-87) is the only important instance of armed protest, the social distress then revealed was common enough in the more settled portions of the East.

The national wealth had greatly increased by the opening of the nineteenth century. But it had been won by hard toil, exerted amid want and suffering, and little of it remained in the hands of the laborers and farmers who had borne the brunt of the struggle. Wages were low, and the working-day was long, usually from twelve to fifteen hours. The wealthy classes raided the legislatures for land-grants and for business charters embodying the most valuable privileges. Furthermore, they joined hands to employ the law against combinations of workmen. The strike of the New York sailors in 1802 was broken by the arrest of the leader, and that of the Philadelphia shoemakers in 1805 resulted in a number of convictions for conspiracy. The New York shoemakers organized in 1805, and in 1809 endeavored to enforce a uniform wage-scale. Twenty-six members were accordingly arrested, tried, and convicted of "perniciously and deceitfully designing, unlawfully and unjustly, to extort great sums of money" from their masters, although they offered the plea that the wage-scale, if granted, would afford them "only a bare maintenance."

Matters improved somewhat up to 1812. But an economic crisis followed the declaration of war with Great Britain, and another occurred in 1814. The close of the war found industry prostrate, with the condition of the workers little better than it had been at the close of the Revolution. The country had now, however, a stable industrial basis, and a prompt revival followed. But when the workers attempted to get their share of the fruits of this activity they found it denied them. The Philadelphia shoemakers struck for the fifth time in 1815, and were suppressed by the law; while the ship carpenters and caulkers in the various ports, who began a series of strikes in 1817, were equally unsuccessful. Something of the nature of the current distress is given in a little essay, "Some Causes of Popular Poverty," by Dr. C. C. Blatchley (Philadelphia, 1817). Depicting the privation of the masses, he ascribes it to various causes, in particular the "enriching nature of interests, rents, duties, inheritances, and church establishments." In 1818 came another crisis, but its effects were not severe. Indeed, conditions in average times were so bad that one's imagination to-day would be at a loss in trying to picture them in panic times. The small farmers of New England were as badly off as the laborers of Philadelphia and New York. "In 1820," says Greeley, speaking of the

farmers in his section of New Hampshire, "almost every one was hopelessly involved, every third farm was in the sheriff's hands, and every poor man leaving for the West who could raise the money requisite for getting away. Everything was cheap, dog cheap; yet the comparatively rich were embarrassed, and the poor were often compulsorily idle and on the brink of famine." The usual meal of the Greeley family consisted of "a five-quart milkpan filled with bean porridge . . . the meal consisted of porridge, and porridge only." The family removed about this time to Vermont, and found life still harder in that State.

The national wealth grew apace. Hardy pioneers penetrated to the South and West, built houses and workshops in the wilderness, and added a new territory to civilization. By 1821 nine new States had been created west and south of the Pennsylvania border. In the East, also, the upbuilding process went rapidly forward. Yet the condition of the workers had changed but little for the better. In New York State, in 1822, they wrested a partial franchise from the land-holding classes; but the change brought them no immediate economic benefit. Even the agitation for the repeal of the law imprisoning debtors, though begun shortly after the close of the Revolution, was so far unsuccessful.

A general social revolt in behalf of the workers of farm and city began in 1825-26. George Henry Evans's "Man" and "The Working-man's Advocate" voiced the political demands of the toilers. A wave of communistic feeling swept the country, lasting some three years, during which eleven colonies were founded, chief among which were Miss Frances Wright's settlement in Tennessee, and Robert Owen's, at New Harmony, Indiana. But it was an unfortunate time for such experiments, or, for that matter, for any other sort of innovation in social industry. A panic, the first of the true "world crises," occasioned by a disturbance of the cotton market, fell upon the business world in the winter of 1825-26. The effect on labor was disastrous, the depression probably affecting the workers of the factory towns of New England worst of all. In the city of New York, according to L. Byllesby, a contemporary author, quoted by Mr. Charles Sotheran in his "Horace Greeley and Other Pioneers of American Socialism," there were, on January 1, 1826, "at least one-fourth of the journeymen in its different mechanic arts destitute of settled employment." Such a situation, however, according to an authority for a slightly later time, was a common one, and it appears likely that still worse effects of the depression occurred during the following winter. The capitalistic régime was yet in a measure primitive: something of the feudatory conditions of colonial days re-

mained. "Feudal slavery," writes "A Loaf-Bread Baker," in a pamphlet published in 1827, "holds a distinctive trait in more than one branch of the division of labor in the city of New York." Though the current of business was again set going during the spring and summer of 1827, the workers do not appear to have reaped much benefit. A speech of Miss Wright's, delivered in the spring of 1829, refers pathetically to the general want and misery of New York's poor during the previous winter.

The general agitation, begun in 1825-26, crystallized in 1829 in the organization both in New York State and in New England of a comparatively strong workingmen's party, which achieved certain successes before being absorbed into the Democratic party. In New York it secured the passage of a mechanics' lien law (1830) and the repeal of the imprisonment-for-debt law (1831), while in Massachusetts it served to draw general attention to the frightful treatment of factory operatives. Women and children in the factories, it was disclosed, were frequently beaten with cowhides and otherwise maltreated. An instance was shown of a deaf and dumb boy receiving a hundred lashes "from his neck to his feet," and another of the breaking of the leg of an eleven-year-old girl by a club thrown at her by an employer.

The helpless poverty complained of by Miss Wright would seem to have been a chronic state for at least the winter months. No testimony on this point can be stronger than that of Greeley. Writing of the general conditions of the time, but particularly of the winter of 1831-32 in the city of New York, he says: "Mechanics and laborers lived awhile on the scanty savings of the preceding summer and autumn; then on such credit as they could wring from grocers and landlords, till milder weather brought them work again. . . . It was much the same every winter." The Boston carpenters struck work in 1832, for a reduction of hours from fourteen to ten, but were beaten. The political movement in Massachusetts was formally organized during this year as the "New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics, and Other Workingmen," who declared a "fixed determination to persevere until our wrongs are redressed." The times were against the organization, however, and it succumbed, though to its influence can be traced the passage of the first child labor law (1836), miserably inadequate as it proved to be. In the city of New York, according to Greeley, matters were quite as bad in 1834 as they had been in 1831.

Another political movement now began in the latter city by the organization of the Equal Rights party (1834-35). The grievances

recited in its various platforms and resolutions depict a situation which would be intolerable to the mass of workers to-day. At the same time the trade-union movement, which had been slowly gathering strength since 1830, began a concerted agitation (1834) for a ten-hour day. A series of strikes was declared in various parts of the country, eleven being recorded for 1835. Some measure of success followed this movement, particularly in New York and in Philadelphia. But the Supreme Court of New York stepped in with a decision (1836) that labor organizations were unlawful; and in June of that year twenty tailors were fined an aggregate of \$1,150 "for engaging in a strike for higher wages." The discrimination against labor shown in this decision may be judged from the fact that the period was one characterized by a general organization of small shopkeepers and merchants, as well as of bankers and "captains of industry," all of whose societies received the protection of the law. There were, in the language of a contemporary resolution, "countless combinations of aristocracy; boards of banks and other chartered directories; boards of brokers; boards of trade and commerce; combinations of landlords; coal and wood dealers, monopolists, and all those who grasp at everything and produce nothing."

The second of the great "world crises" came in the winter of 1836-37. Bread riots broke out in New York on February 12, 1837, and another riot was narrowly averted on May 10. The following winter was the worst the poor had known; but it fell to the winter of 1838-39 to wreak an unexampled degree of suffering. "Not less than 10,000 persons," writes Mr. Myers, after examining contemporary records, "were in utter poverty and had no other means of surviving the winter than those afforded by the charity of neighbors." "As the cold months wore slowly on," writes James Parton, on information given him by Greeley, "the sufferings of the poor became so aggravated, and the number of the unemployed increased to such a degree, that the ordinary means were inadequate to relieve even those who were destitute of every one of the necessities of life. Some died of starvation. Some were frozen to death. Many, through exposure and privation, contracted fatal diseases." The distress extended to every city, hamlet, and farm of the nation.

During this panic the Equal Rights party passed out of existence; many of the trade-unions disbanded; the working-day was generally restored to the old figures of from twelve to fifteen hours; and wages were reduced to a bare pittance. The revival of business gave the workman employment, though under the worst of the old conditions. Gen-

eral attention was now drawn to the lot of the poor; and a new and powerful social agitation, begun by Albert Brisbane, in 1841, spread throughout the country. It had come to be generally recognized that, panic or no panic, the permanent state of the working mass was one of needless misery. Many of the brightest intellects of the nation — such, for instance, as Horace Greeley, Charles A. Dana, George Ripley, Nathaniel Hawthorne, William Henry Channing, George William Curtis, John Sullivan Dwight, and Mr. Parke Godwin — joined in the propaganda. The practical form which the movement took — a very impracticable form, as it turned out — was that of the founding of communities, of which thirty-four were established between 1842 and 1849. Of these Brook Farm will always remain the classical example.

That the lot of the masses improved but slightly in the years following the great crisis is shown by a number of instances of contemporary testimony. In 1844, six years after the hard winter described by Parton, Mr. Parke Godwin writes of "the precarious and miserable existence" of the middle and lower classes, and describes the world of industry as a "veritable hell." "One in seventeen of its [New York State's] inhabitants," he says, "is supported by charity. In the city of New York, the almshouse has administered relief, in the year 1843, to 40,000 persons! This is at the rate of one to seven and one-half of the population." In a speech delivered in New York, on April 4, 1844, Charles A. Dana denies that labor receives its just reward of the wealth being created, and declares that "the whole tendency of industry is perpetually to disgrace the laborer, to grind him down and reduce his wages." In the same year, Orestes A. Brownson, who had examined into the conditions of the New England toilers, writes of "the unspeakable misery and destitution of the laboring classes." "Lamentable as is the condition of the laboring man," read the resolutions of the New England Workingmen's Association (1845), "that of woman is worse, and increasingly so." The farmers felt the stress as well, and had begun to organize. At the convention of the Michigan State Farmers in 1844, a paper prepared by S. Denton was read, which asserted that "the non-producing class — lawyers, bankers, merchants, etc.," received annually out of American industry \$889,087,409, while the enormously larger class of laborers received only \$157,097,591.

The half-decade 1845–50 was characterized by a number of labor disturbances. There must have been ample provocation, judging from a declaration of Greeley's. In a speech delivered November 20, 1846, he said: "Work, work, give us something to do — anything that will

secure us honest bread' — is at this moment the prayer of not less than 30,000 human beings within sound of our City Hall bell." In 1845 the workers in certain Pittsburg factories demanded a reduction of hours in the working-day. The manufacturers answered them that, whereas the Massachusetts employers enforced a seventy-two hour week, they themselves were satisfied with a sixty-eight hour week, and declined to accede to the demand. An unsuccessful strike followed, in which 4,000 employees engaged. It should be pointed out that the general working-day in Massachusetts at that time was, on the authority of Col. North, fourteen hours instead of twelve, the work in winter lasting until nine o'clock, though on account of stoppages for meals the effective working time was but slightly in excess of twelve hours. The matter of the working-day seems to have been the cause of most of the strikes of that year, though the matter of wages also came in, particularly in the case of the iron-puddlers of Pittsburg. A ten-hour day had become general in Baltimore in 1840, the same year in which President Van Buren established it in the departments at Washington. For the rest of the country, however, the old working-day continued. A general agitation to secure monthly and weekly payments also dates from this half-decade. It was strongly resisted, and only by slow changes was the present custom finally established.

The panic of 1847 again brought labor to an unusual degree of privation. The effects lasted in one form or another for some time. On January 17, 1850, in a speech before the New York Typographical Society, Greeley declares: "In this thriving commercial emporium of the New World . . . there are at this day not less than 40,000 human beings anxious to earn the bread of honest industry, but vainly seeking and painfully, despairingly awaiting opportunity for so doing." And again: "The laboring class, as a class, is just where it was when I came here eighteen years ago, or if anything in a worse condition."

We have here the summing-up, at the mid-century period, of one of the shrewdest observers of social facts that this country has produced, wherein it is denied that any real improvement had taken place in the condition of the laborer since 1831. Where, then, was the "golden age"? It could not have been before that year, as I have shown, and Greeley had seen no indication of it in the nineteen years following.

The great editor might have made a somewhat different statement, however, had he waited another year or two before delivering his dictum. Beginning with the spring of 1850, and lasting till the panic of 1857, there was unquestionably a moderate rise of wages and a gradual

shortening of the working-day. The discovery of gold in California and Australia gave a marked impetus to business of all kinds, and employment became more regular. The workers again built up their organizations, and demands upon their employers became general. A bulletin of the Bureau of Labor records thirteen strikes throughout the country in 1853, and an equal number in 1854. The record is incomplete, however, since in the city of New York alone a succession of strikes, involving practically every trade, was declared during the years 1850-53. They were made on a rising market, and were mostly successful.

But though important successes were gained, it was yet a far cry to a golden age. The eleven-hour day did not become general until well on toward 1865; the monthly and weekly pay-day not until about 1860; while the first real factory law—that of Massachusetts—dates from the comparatively recent time of 1866. As for wages, the weight of testimony puts them for the decade 1850-60 at about one-half the present figures. Controversy on this subject is vigorous, and seemingly interminable. The excellent summary, however, recently made by M. Levasseur, after a searching comparison of all available statistics, ought to tend to a settlement of the question. His conclusion is emphatic on the point that nominal wages "have risen very perceptibly, perhaps doubled, in the last fifty years"; and that real wages, *i.e.*, wages measured according to their purchasing power, have risen more than nominal wages.

No one pretends that a golden age has been observed since the Civil War; and the testimony here quoted makes it equally impossible for any previous period. The notion of its existence is natural enough, for it is a common characteristic of mankind, when facing present struggles and bitternesses, to hark back to some remote period in the life of the individual, the community, or the race, and to clothe that period in the richest vesture of the imagination. But, natural as the notion is, it is one to be given over, for it is woven of the stuff of which dreams are made.

W. J. GHENT.

THE USES OF SPECULATION.

THE recent crash in the New York stock market has been fruitful in the usual homilies against the wickedness of speculation. Those who know the least of the mechanism of organized markets are among the loudest in proclaiming, like a Washington clergyman, that "this stock gambling is a thing of the same nature as the gambling at the faro or the roulette table." "You may dress it up in respectable clothes," we are told, "and call it by a respectable name, but you can't change its real nature; it is gambling and nothing else but gambling."

It is surprising how widely this view prevails in its crudest form. That the produce and stock exchanges are parasites upon the social organism, and might better be brushed off, is an opinion which seems to be prevalent even among people who on most subjects are fairly well informed. It is an opinion which prevails not merely in quarters where it has a political explanation, as among a few farmers who have turned Populists because the price of grain has fallen, but also among persons who have no political or personal interest in yielding to such misconceptions. Another minister of the gospel, at a recent dinner at which I was present, talked glibly of the business of those who dealt in "wind," made "imaginary sales" of what they did not possess, and made up "the bulls and bears" of the stock market. The speaker appeared to believe that all such persons, conservative brokers as well as ignorant speculators, deserved to fall under the same condemnation.

There is no doubt of the soundness of these criticisms, so far as they are directed against bucket shops, and even against the gambling spirit of persons who are ignorant of the principles underlying stock-market speculation, and who expect to get rich without rendering an equivalent service. This sort of gambling, whether through the bucket shops or the stock exchanges, is properly a subject of the severest censure; and there is no reason for wasting sympathy upon persons of this character when they lose.

The trouble with most criticism of the stock market is that it is not discriminating. The produce exchanges and the stock markets

have their legitimate function in the mechanism of modern industry. It is a most important function; it is eminently legitimate and useful; and the whole fabric which permits the free movement of commodities and capital between different countries at nearly uniform rates would be hopelessly deranged if these markets were abolished. The importance of the stock and produce exchanges is so great, and their operations are so interwoven with all the other operations of modern commerce, that it is difficult to decide where to begin in choosing among the many reasons for their existence. These fundamental propositions, however, may be fairly laid down:

1. It is the function of the produce and stock exchanges to give to products and to capital the highest usefulness of which they are capable.
2. This end is attained because the exchanges, by bringing to a common focus the facts and judgments which determine prices, are the most sensitive and accurate registers of values.
3. Products and capital have the highest usefulness where they command the highest prices, because those who need them most can afford to pay the most.
4. The exchanges, being the common centres in which values are determined, direct through the medium of prices the movements of produce and capital with a promptness and a precision which would not be possible under any other system.

Through the publicity given to quotations on the exchanges, therefore, and the promptness of communication between the exchanges of the world, goods and capital move from place to place under the influence of the law of the greatest good to the community, with the least waste of energy, the smallest misdirection of effort, and the most continuous efficiency possible in the present state of knowledge among men. This is the theory of the exchanges and the reason for their existence. Great as may have been the errors and abuses connected with them, they have contributed immeasurably toward carrying out the purposes just mentioned.

Let the propositions be considered in some detail and supported by argument and illustration. In the ordinary world of business, it is obviously a general rule that products are most useful where the highest prices are paid for them. If there is more wheat in Chicago than the people of Chicago are likely to need for a long time to come, the price falls. If there is too little wheat in London to meet the needs of the people, it is obvious that the price will tend to rise. Such a rise of price will be necessary to set the wheat in motion from Chicago, the point

where it is superfluous, to London, the point where it is needed. This is the principle which underlies the operation of the produce markets.

But it may be insisted that this statement does not meet the case of the sale of wheat which does not exist. It deals only with wheat actually existing in the Chicago bins. It refers simply to a transfer of existing wheat, and not to a transaction in "imaginary wheat." Let the reasoning, then, be carried a step further. Let the London dealer offer to deliver wheat within two weeks to London bakers at a certain price. He has not the wheat, but he relies upon his ability to obtain it at a profit from Chicago within the time set. Under modern conditions he is able to cable an order to the Chicago produce exchange for ten thousand bushels of wheat. Whether he chooses to send the cable before he offers to sell to the London baker is a question for his own judgment. He takes the risk in such a case that he will be able to buy wheat for delivery at a profit, and he stakes his judgment upon his ability to do so.

This simple statement of the case embodies the fundamental principle of produce exchange transactions. In the case assumed, all persons in London who realized the scarcity of wheat there would be able to place orders instantly in Chicago. The result would be that the Chicago price would advance until it reached practically the level of the London price, with the necessary allowances for transportation, commissions, insurance, loss of interest, and the profit of the London dealer.

It is the very fact that prices in the two markets respond almost simultaneously to the same influence, which makes the operations of the exchanges so puzzling under modern conditions. If there were no cable, and the London buyer relied upon his foresight and good luck to dispatch a swift-sailing packet-boat from London to New York, carrying a special messenger to buy at Chicago prices before the scarcity in London was generally known in Chicago, the conditions would be similar to those which would exist without the present system of prompt communication between the exchanges of the world. The difference in prices would be much greater, and the chances of profit would be greater; but the individual speculator would take greater risks, and if he made larger profits it would be at the expense of producer and consumer.

Even the elimination of prompt communication in the case assumed leaves intact the theory of an organized market in Chicago, where all the wheat held would be brought to a common level of price. If the opponents of the produce exchanges were able to wipe out central markets, however, the chances for uncertainties and differ-

ences in prices would be greatly increased. It would then be possible for the agent of the London buyer to traverse the wheat country of Iowa and Kansas and buy wheat from the farmers at any price for which they were willing to sell. In the absence of knowledge on their part that wheat was scarce in London and that the European world faced the risk of famine, they would sell their wheat at a much smaller price than if they knew the facts. The result in either case would be that the shrewd foreign purchaser, by acting promptly and concealing the desperate state of the European wheat market, might pick up ten thousand or a million bushels of wheat at thirty per cent less than if the sensitive nerve of the stock ticker were keeping all markets in touch with each other so that early suspicions of scarcity in Europe should produce their normal effect in the steady rise of prices in Chicago.

The purpose of the produce exchanges, therefore, is to establish common markets where the influences which affect value may bring prices to a common level. Hence, every event in the world which affects price is felt upon the exchanges; and it comes to be said that future events, when they occur, have been already "discounted." Many important events which would cause a sudden break or rise in prices, if they came like thunderbolts from a clear sky, are thus "discounted" before they actually take place. This fact is the highest compliment to the organization of the exchanges and the best proof of their usefulness. The mere suspicion in well-informed quarters that wheat is to be scarce six months hence leads to its gradual rise in price. Shrewd dealers begin at once to make contracts for wheat at current quotations for delivery in the future, because they believe they will be able to sell at a higher price when the scarcity has dawned upon other buyers. If, on the contrary, they have information which leads them to believe that there will be a great surplus of wheat six months hence, they sell for September delivery at a price below the market. The market breaks and prices begin to fall. They may not have the wheat or know just where they will get it; but they stake their judgment, based upon their knowledge of world supplies, that they will be able to get it somewhere for delivery below the price at which they are selling.

Does not this very statement of the case prove that selling "wind" or "imaginary wheat" depresses the price? In a sense and for a time, such sales undoubtedly tend to lower prices, but only because the seller is convinced that the real value of the wheat is less than the value at which it is selling. He must answer with his fortune for an error of judgment in this respect. Let us see what happens if he has blundered.

September arrives; the anticipations of the "bears" are disappointed; wheat is scarce, and the price is higher than the price at which they agreed to sell. But they are bound to make certain deliveries of wheat. If they have not been able to buy real wheat at the prices at which they sold for September delivery, they must go into the market and buy it. Their presence adds to the pressure of an already crowded list of buyers, and prices shoot up in at least the same proportion in which they went down when the present buyers "beared" the market through their mistake of judgment by selling too low for September delivery.

This statement of the case is crude, but it involves the principle. What actually happens is not that a single buyer or seller can control the market against the judgment of the majority. Whatever price rules in March for September wheat usually represents fairly the judgment of the majority of men dealing in the market, based upon all the facts which they are able to gather under modern conditions of information and quick communication. This judgment may be in error. If so, those who make the error pay for it by their losses, and, if their losses are heavy enough, by being driven from the market. Their operations verify the sagacious remark of a French student of the subject, that speculation succeeds only when it renders a service — when it has anticipated a future need and satisfied it.

Let us try to see what this service is. It does not consist simply in transferring wheat from a market where it is plentiful to a market where it is scarce. It consists also, as already pointed out, in preparing for coming events. This preparation, this "discounting" of the future, forewarns every producer and holder of wheat that the price is going upward or downward in the future, according to the judgment of men who make it their business to study the conditions of demand and supply. Hence, every producer is able to adjust his prices to those discounted future prices, which are published to the world through the system of organized markets.

Still another service is rendered by this discounting of the future. It is a service rendered to the community as a consuming body rather than to the producer. It consists in the husbanding of the world's product against future needs. If it is evident to careful judges that wheat and cotton are to be scarce in September, and their purchases for future delivery cause prices to advance, the whole world is notified to practise economy and judgment in the use of these products. The whole world is advised also that it is profitable to produce them. This argument is applicable to cotton cloth, whiskey, or sugar, if they are represented by

industrial securities on the stock exchange, as well as to natural products. Hence, capital will be diverted from industries where production is excessive to those where production is deficient. This, from the broad point of view of the interest of the community, is the most vital service which is rendered by organized markets. When prices fall radically for any product, it is an advertisement that there is more on the market, or in sight, than is needed; when prices rise, it is an advertisement that the supply, present and future, is growing scanty. In either case the rate of profit responds to the new conditions, and the volume of production tends to be modified according to the rate of profit.

The same services which are performed by the produce markets in equalizing production and distribution are performed by the stock markets also. If the fact is not quite so obvious, it is because securities are one degree removed in their direct utility from wheat, corn, or cotton. They represent products instead of being products themselves. The fluctuations in the value of railway securities represent the public estimate of the value of those securities. This estimate is affected primarily by earning power, but is influenced also by such factors as the prudence or recklessness of the management of the road, the degree of prosperity in the country which it traverses, the possibility of hostile State legislation, the danger from existing or future competitive lines, the state of general business, and the risk of the adverse influence of political events, like war or an election, upon the probable safety and productiveness of the investment. These influences are in a constant state of flux, and there is an interplay of each upon all the others, which is reflected by the daily fluctuations of the stock market. These fluctuations simply reflect the ripples of opinion passing through the minds of the best judges regarding the value of such properties. Only great events produce fluctuations reaching the magnitude of ocean waves; but, because there are changes which seem to the careless observer to be without cause, it does not follow that the surface of the market does not record as sensitively and accurately the changes in real values as a body of water by the changes on its surface measures the quiet influences of the zephyrs and unseen currents or the upheavals of the tempest.

Hence it comes about that the exchanges, by affording a constant barometer of the prices of the products in which they deal, influence the state of demand and supply, and thereby make possible the highest usefulness of products and of capital. The extreme sensitiveness of this barometer is due to the fact that all the influences which affect values find expression through its oscillations. It is sometimes said of a sudden

break in the value of securities, such as occurred when President Cleveland transmitted to Congress his celebrated message regarding Venezuela, that it is "merely a stock market panic." The implication of those who make such observations usually is that it is not a condition which affects the solid substance of production and industry.

If the stock market responds more promptly than general trade to events which threaten the stability of business, it is because it performs the same function for business which the heart performs for the body. If a panic occurred in the stock market when President Cleveland recommended that the United States should intervene on behalf of the territorial integrity of Venezuela, it was because the infinite possibilities of war with Great Britain — such as the interference with the market for wheat and for cotton, the disturbance of communication by sea, the diminution of earnings by the railways, with, perhaps, the suspension of gold payments by the Federal Treasury, flashed like a panorama across the minds of intelligent brokers. If fears of war were soon dissipated, and quotations resumed their normal course without serious disturbance to less responsive markets, it was, probably, because of the emphatic warning given to those in authority by Wall Street and Lombard Street, through a "stock exchange panic," of the havoc which war would work in the value and security of all the enterprises upon which Americans and Englishmen depended for their daily bread.

One of the benefits of organized markets which has already been suggested by implication deserves a more specific statement. This is the publicity which is given to market quotations. Time was when deception was easy regarding prices of all products, because of the difficulty of communication between markets. Even within recent times people have starved in one province of China while grain rotted on the ground in another, because there were not means of communication and transportation.

The fact that it is still possible, within narrow limits, to make a profit through exclusive information gives a bad odor, in the minds of the unreflecting, to the produce and stock exchanges. But it is the whole purpose and tendency of their organization to reduce such possibilities of deception to the narrowest point. It is only necessary to contemplate for a moment what might happen in the absence of organized markets to conclude how much they have contributed to do justice between the producer and his patrons. The producer cannot be deceived as to the judgment of those who make it a business to study present and probable changes in prices. The market reports will tell him what is

the judgment of those who in order to ascertain the truth are paying millions of dollars to experts, to telegraph lines, and to cable companies. By the expenditure of a few pennies for a daily journal, nearly all the benefits of their outlay and the conclusions they have reached are brought to his door every morning, put into the tangible form of prices.

Publicity, therefore, is one of the obvious benefits of the system of organized markets. It is not a publicity, moreover, which is limited to the present. Equally public is the judgment of all these experts, based upon all the millions they have spent for learning the truth, regarding the future prices of products as reflected by prices for future delivery. False information is sometimes disseminated; errors of judgment sometimes occur. There is not space here to discuss these in detail. It may be freely admitted that these abuses are enormous, that these errors are great and sometimes wilful. But they cannot begin to cause to the humble producer on the farm or the cotton field the errors and losses he would suffer if he were at the mercy of the travelling and irresponsible agents of great speculators who kept their information secret, and who paid their millions for the purpose of deceiving the community. False information no longer misleads for any considerable time; it no longer goes far. If the rash owner of millions undertakes to corner a market, he usually suffers the penalty himself. He finds that he is dealing with the unseen forces of truth throughout the world, which baffle his calculations by unmasking his deceptions, or by drawing from remote quarters, under the attraction of high prices, the unsuspected reserves of the products which he seeks to manipulate.

The stock market offers the most effective safeguard to-day against unexpected demands upon the money market. By providing a means of exchange which supplements metallic money in international operations, the stock market gives to the money market that wonderful elasticity which permits loans of hundreds of millions to be floated without disturbance, and which enables the larger markets to resist catastrophes with a firmness and a readiness of rebound which would not have been possible in transactions of such magnitude half a century ago.

Nothing can be more beautiful from the standpoint of pure reasoning, and nothing is more vital to the smooth working of the great machine of modern civilized life than this transfer of capital through the mechanism of the stock market. Let us suppose the volume of capital seeking investment, both permanent and temporary, to be as large as it is to-day, but without any common markets in which transferable securities could be sold. Then what would happen if a sudden demand for money should

fall upon London, Paris, or New York? If the entire demand had to be met in gold, or even in trade bills of exchange, the result would be a drain upon the market where the money was demanded which would result in convulsion upon convulsion, in the impairment of values below any point ever reached in a "stock market panic," and in the paralysis of the whole industrial mechanism of the country. Mills would stop and wages would cease to be paid, because the commercial banks would be called upon to denude themselves of gold and commercial bills, so that they would hoard with the tenacity of terror what little money they had left.

How does the stock market avert such dangers? Simply by substituting securities for money. If money becomes plentiful in a given market like New York, the surplus gravitates to the stock market. This increases the offer of money for securities, and the prices of securities rise. Such securities are then drawn by the magnet of high prices from other markets, where money is less plentiful and prices are lower. The money, in other words, is drawn from the market where it is redundant to the market where it is most needed. It becomes profitable to sell securities for money where they bring a good price, because the money obtained for them can be lent at a high rate in the market where it is scarce. The rate of interest for money thus cooperates with the fluctuations in securities to maintain, in the supply of money and loanable capital, a balance which is the more accurate in proportion to the ease with which securities and money move between markets.

The cost of shipping gold was once a controlling factor in the difference in the rates for money. Securities have now to a large extent taken the place of gold in these international exchanges. The cost of shipment is smaller, the risk is less, and the time required for making transactions has been reduced by the use of the telegraph, the ocean cable, and the telephone. The larger the ownership of foreign securities on a given market, the more elastic is the cushion which that market presents against sudden shocks. Foreign securities do not usually suffer impairment from the same causes which affect domestic securities, and they therefore represent in international transactions the most perfect substitute for money. The nation which possesses a store of such securities of the first class is better protected against disaster than by idle hoards of gold.

The Germans learned this to their chagrin when they imposed their great war indemnity of \$1,000,000,000 upon France in 1871. There was not gold enough or silver enough in all France to pay the debt. If

it had not been for the mechanism of the stock market, business in France would have been brought to a halt through the loss of the tool for carrying it on. But Frenchmen owned many millions of foreign railway and government securities. These were thrown on the market, and were bought in London, Berlin, and Brussels; and the crafty Frenchman had then only to give an order to his government for the transfer of the proceeds of his sale to Berlin, without surrendering a franc in coined money to the conqueror. This was only one of several classes of operations by which the indemnity was discharged; but it may be truly said that the mechanism of the stock market and the international money market saved France from convulsions which would have reacted disastrously upon the civilized world.

The stock market, therefore, acts as a reservoir and distributor of capital, with something of the same efficiency with which a series of well-regulated locks and dams operates to equalize the irregular current of a river. The hand of man is being stretched out in the valley of the Nile to build great storage basins and locks, that the waters which flow down the great river may be husbanded until they are needed, when they are released in small but sufficient quantities to fertilize the country and tide over the periods of drought. Something of the same service is performed for accumulations of capital by the delicate series of reservoirs, sluice gates, and locks provided by the mechanism of the stock market. The rate of interest measures the rise and fall of the supply of capital, as the locks determine the ebb and flow of the life-giving water. The existence of negotiable securities is in the nature of a great reserve reservoir, obviating the destructive effects of demands which might drain away the supply of actual coin, and preventing the panic and disaster which, without such a safeguard, would frequently occur in the market for capital.

The legitimate employment of the produce and stock exchanges by men who know what they are about tends to reduce the speculative element in business operations rather than to increase it. This is one of the most useful functions of the exchanges. To put an illustration simply, let it be assumed that the owner of a cotton mill deals directly on the exchanges instead of through the machinery of brokers. If he has made a contract for the delivery of a large quantity of cotton goods in China in January next, it is highly important that he should obtain his raw material at the present prices. Accordingly, he enters the market and buys cotton "futures"—that is, contracts for cotton to be delivered to him at some specified date when he knows that he will need it for his mills. If he can buy "futures" at prices which ensure a profit, he is

protected against the subsequent fluctuations in the cotton market. The contract with the Chinese importer is reduced from a dangerously speculative enterprise, so far as it affects his profits, to one of simple business calculation.

But suppose that cotton begins to fall below the price which he was willing to pay. Is he not a loser by the amount by which the price he has paid for "futures" is above the prevailing price? Fortunately not. The varied resources and flexibility of the exchanges afford him a means of protection. He has only to enter the market and sell "futures" at what he now believes to be the proper price. If this price is higher than he thinks will be the actual price in September, he will be able when September arrives to buy cash cotton at a price which will enable him to meet his sales of September futures at a profit. Thus, even if he is obliged to accept the consequences of his first error by paying too much for one lot of September cotton, he has partially offset it by his profit on his later sales of futures and his purchases of cash cotton. The intervention of the speculator in these matters relieves producers and manufacturers of much of the risk by his assuming it for himself. His function was well described by Mr. Arthur Raffalovich in the introduction to one of his annual volumes on the money market:

"The receiver of margins is an insurer. By means of the margins which he receives on both sides, he binds himself to accept delivery from the producer in case of a fall and to deliver to the manufacturer in case of a rise. Every insurer should determine the amount of his margins by the extent of the risk. The insurer who conducts only one operation risks much, but when he conducts many operations the margins which he earns cover the risks which he runs."

It is this means of averaging losses and gains which lies at the basis of legitimate operations on the exchanges. Life insurance is a speculation upon the chances of death — perhaps the most immoral of all speculations conceivable if looked at with the jaundiced eye with which the produce and stock exchanges are too often regarded. But life insurance has been reduced to a science, and protection against risks in dealing in staple products and in capital has also been reduced to a science by those who have made it a study. Neither wheat nor cotton nor money could be handled so smoothly and economically, or sold or rented on such favorable terms, if these opportunities for insurance were not afforded by the machinery for buying and selling "futures" on the produce exchanges, and by "long" and "short" sales on the stock exchanges.

The produce exchanges serve as the best illustration of the principle involved in most of these transactions, because cotton and wheat present

a more tangible reality to the average mind than the abstraction of loanable capital. But the operation is substantially the same, and its purposes are substantially the same, in the stock market. The man who believes that a given security, like a railroad stock, is selling for much more than its legitimate value enters the market and sells "short" in order to make a profit from the subsequent fall. In selling "short" he acts purely in his own interest, but he unconsciously renders a public service. He increases the offer of the security, and thereby tends to depress the price toward what he believes to be the legitimate price. This is the function of the "bear" in the security market. When shrewd brokers or speculators are selling "short" in any given security, it is pretty good evidence that they believe that the earning value of the security is below its price at the time, and that the price will soon fall to the real value.

Thus the existence of organized markets operates in more ways than one as insurance against loss and excessive fluctuations. It not only affords protection to the individual, by enabling him to "hedge" when he has made a mistaken calculation, but it affords protection to the whole community by applying the test of the pessimistic judgments to the bubbles blown by the optimistic. John Law, who wrecked French finance early in the eighteenth century, would hardly have been able to carry the shares of his company to more than 3,000 per cent of par if the system of "short" selling had been thoroughly understood and practised by a coterie of intelligent brokers. He might have denounced "short sales," in the Populist jargon, as selling "wind," but he would have found that these sales were steadily forcing down the price of his paper, and saving thousands from ruin by pricking the walls of his expanding bubble before it became too large.

What has gone before is an exposition of the nature of legitimate trading on the exchanges. There are two forms of abuse which are assimilated to legitimate trading in such a way as to create confusion in the public mind. One of these has no connection whatever with the regular market, although it is often assumed by the ignorant to be only a reflection on a smaller scale of the operations of the exchanges. This is the form of gambling carried on in "bucket shops." These shops are places where bets are taken, in a somewhat disguised form, on the course of the market. The customer bets that a given stock will rise, by putting up a "margin" to be forfeited if it falls, just as the gambler at Monte Carlo bets against the bank. The radical difference between this transaction and that on the regular exchanges is that the bucket shop usually places

no orders for the articles purported to be dealt in, and that its operations cannot affect demand and supply in the market. The transaction on the exchanges, however speculative it may be, involves the obligation to deliver the article, and in the case of securities the actual pledging of the securities for the loan obtained to buy them. The "margin" in this case represents the difference between what the bank is willing to lend on the securities, and the amount required to make up the market price. This is actually a margin within the meaning of the term, while the bucket shop "margin" is only a wager and not a margin. Operations on the exchanges are sometimes unduly speculative in motive, and are made without due examination of the facts necessary to an intelligent purchase or sale. To this extent they constitute an abuse, but in form they are not distinguishable from legitimate transactions. How these abuses create misconceptions is well illustrated by the following editorial paragraph from a leading Eastern newspaper:

"Sporting men generally view James R. Keene's distinction between gambling and stock speculation as equally applicable to betting on horse races or prize-fights. Mr. Keene says that he does not gamble in his stock operations, because all of his buying and selling on the exchange is based on deep study of the properties which the stocks that he speculates in represent. If he buys or sells a railroad bond it is because he has investigated closely the condition of that particular railroad, and has reached an intelligent conclusion as to its earning capacity. The 'based-on-knowledge' theory, however, can be applied far and wide. The bettor on horse races makes a close study of pedigree and training and conditions generally before trying to pick the winner."

No better text than this could be found as a basis for drawing a distinction which is vital in these matters. What may be the character or methods of Mr. James R. Keene — whether good, bad, or indifferent — is not pertinent to the purposes of this article, except for the fact that he deals in actual securities on the stock exchange. If a man is not justified in buying securities because he believes they have value and selling them because he believes they are losing value, it is pertinent to ask what motive should control the course of investors? The writer of the paragraph quoted apparently mixes up two different things — legitimate trading on the exchanges, and betting on the fluctuations of the market through the bucket shops.

If Mr. Keene was a bucket-shop patron, he would correspond to "the bettor on horse races." But this is just what he is not, if he is a dealer in securities on the stock exchange. The critic has chosen his comparison with art, because some degree of unconscious odium may attach to the occupations of horse dealers and jockeys, just as it attaches in the minds of certain people to brokers, by the reflected discredit which is

legitimately cast upon bucket-shop operators. But the question whether breeding horses is legitimate is apart from the issues involved in the comparison. If the highly developed horse has a reason for being, then those who develop him are doing a legitimate business. They are seeking by the study of pedigrees, the crossing of blood, the analysis of foods, the improvement of training, and the best medical care to develop the noblest type of a useful servant of man. The agents or brokers who act for them in the city marts are also engaged in a legitimate business, growing out of the principle of the division of labor.

The man who buys a horse because he believes it is valuable or sells because he believes it has lost its value is exerting a legitimate influence upon the horse market. He "makes a close study of pedigree and training and conditions" because he is interested in the goods dealt in. The man who simply bets on the result, who "makes a close study of pedigree and training and conditions generally before trying to pick the winner," is not doing anything to affect the legitimate market for horseflesh or to raise or depress the price of horses. The man who bets on a horse race is in precisely the position of the man who bets in a bucket shop. Both are gamblers; neither is doing an act which legitimately affects the market; and neither is entitled to any sympathy for his losses or to any special protection by law. Both classes differ radically from actual dealers in horses or in securities.

If the operation of the stock market is beneficent, therefore, under proper conditions, those who deal in the commodities with which the market is concerned are rendering a useful service to the community. They are not doing it as a gratuity. They act from the motive of self-interest. This is the motive which governs the grocer when he locates a shop in a community where he believes that there is a demand for groceries. His motives and the manner of his speculation are exactly identical with those of the intelligent dealer in foreign exchange or of the broker who deals in securities, except that his operations are on a more modest scale. The grocer obeys the law of marginal utility, by seeking the location where he believes there is the greatest need for a new shop. He speculates in futures when he lays in stocks of goods for which he has not received orders. He buys at a given price in the belief that he can sell in future at a higher price. He often takes orders at a given price for goods which he does not possess, in the belief that he can buy in season for delivery at a price which will afford him a profit.

This paper is not written to explain all the intricate details of the stock exchange, or to defend the deceptive manipulations which are at-

tempted by great promoters. The magnitude of modern transactions sometimes involves a menace to the accuracy of the barometer afforded by the stock market, which should serve as a warning to the uninitiated to keep out of it. It is the judgment of experienced brokers that an outsider who speculates continuously never ends as a winner. All these phenomena, however, are only abuses of a legitimate institution. If fortunes are accumulated in a few hands to a degree which threatens the safety of the country and impairs the truthfulness of the barometer of values afforded by the stock market, it is an evil for which a remedy should be sought in other directions than by railing against the market. If a few kings of finance have seized upon the machinery of the market to do wrong, it is no more than they have done with the machinery of government, with patents of priceless value to the community, or even with the necessities of existence. The fact that the stock market exists as a part of the mechanism of modern credit may aid them in doing wrong; just as the facilities afforded by the railway and the telegraph may be abused. The remedy for the misuse of a delicate and useful machine is not to smash the machine, but to do all that is possible to restrict it to its legitimate use.

CHARLES A. CONANT.

THE SPANISH TREATY CLAIMS COMMISSION.

UNDER the rather infelicitous name of "The Spanish Treaty Claims Commission," a new official organization has been started in Washington, purporting to have for its object the adjudication and settlement of a certain class of claims of citizens of the United States against Spain. These claims the President of the United States thought fit to relinquish, in his desire to exhibit "signal generosity" toward Spain,¹ and in consideration of his demand upon her to cede and transfer to the United States her sovereignty over Porto Rico, over all the Spanish islands in the West Indies except Cuba, and over the island of Guam in the Ladrones. It is for students of constitutional law and political science to discuss by what legal authority the President forced Spain to dismember her territory in favor of the United States.² If he took this action in his capacity of Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, the proper channel to exercise this authority would have been the War Department, rather than the Department of State. The result has been to throw into the background the most explicit declarations that no "designs of aggrandizement" or "ambitions of conquest" had in any manner or form prompted the war with Spain. The fact, however, has been accomplished, and if wrong it was righted, and if right it was confirmed, by the subsequent treaty of peace, which was signed at Paris, on December 10, 1898, and which, upon its approval by the Senate by a bare majority, was proclaimed by the President on April 11, 1899.³

¹ Secretary Day to Duke Almodvar del Rio, July 30, 1898.

² In former times the President could not, without the authority of Congress, even take possession of territories ceded by treaty to the United States. In the case of Louisiana, in addition to the approval of the treaty by the Senate, an act was passed, which was approved October 31, 1803, "to enable the President to take possession of the territories ceded by France to the United States, etc." (U. S. Statutes at Large, ii, p. 245). In the case of Florida, a similar act authorizing the President to take possession of and occupy the territories, etc., was passed and approved, March 3, 1821 (U. S. Statutes at Large, iii, p. 67).

³ The treaty hung in the balance for more than four weeks, and it was ratified only by the aid of ten Democratic votes influenced by Mr. Bryan, who was simply and vainly seeking a party advantage. (See Mr. Henry Loomis Nelson's paper in

By article II of this treaty solemn form was given to the cession by Spain of all the islands which the President had demanded; and by article VII of the same the fact was stated that the United States relinquished all claims of its citizens against Spain "that may have arisen [the text does not say where] since the beginning of the late insurrection in Cuba, and prior to the exchange of ratifications of the treaty." The article further says: "The United States will adjudicate and settle the claims of its citizens against Spain relinquished in this article." The negotiators of the treaty on the part of Spain insisted upon perpetuating in some way on the record the fact that the cession of the said islands (article II) had been made in consideration, in part at least, of the relinquishment of these claims. The American negotiators recognized the justice of that insistence, and, as shown by protocol No. 10 of the Conference (October 27, 1898), the President of the American Commission stated that articles II and VII should stand as they were, but that the American Commissioners did not mean thereby to be understood that it should not appear in some proper form in the treaty that the cession of Porto Rico and the other islands above referred to was "on account of indemnity for the losses and injuries of American citizens and the cost of the war." This declaration satisfied the Spanish negotiators.

The Congress of the United States saw itself confronted, at this juncture, with an unexpected and rather unwelcome problem. It was not, unfortunately, the only one of its kind produced by the war. As Mr. Sidney Webster has put it, with grim humor, in his interesting article, "Revelations of a Senate Document,"¹ many a thing brought about by it has been, "like evolution in the terms of Darwinian science, an unintended result."

It was not new for the United States to assume claims of its citizens against Spain or against other nations, and to undertake to adjudicate and settle them. By the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded at Washington, on February 22, 1819, the United States exonerated Spain from all demands for certain American claims; undertook to make satisfaction for them; and appointed three of her own citizens as a Commission which should within three years from its first meeting "receive, examine, and decide upon the amount and validity of all the claims" in question. For the purpose of carrying this arrangement

"*Harper's Weekly*," June 22, 1901.) In spite of this "unexpected" assistance, the majority thus secured did not exceed two votes.

¹ "*North American Review*," June, 1901.

into effect, Congress passed an act, approved March 3, 1821, which provided for the appointment of the said Commissioners, the payment of their salaries, the payment of the awards they should make, etc.

By the treaty between the United States and Mexico, concluded at Guadalupe Hidalgo, on February 2, 1848, the United States exonerated Mexico from certain American claims; undertook to make satisfaction for them; and appointed a Commission of citizens of the United States to ascertain their validity and amount. For the purpose of carrying this arrangement into effect, Congress passed an act, approved March 3, 1849, for the appointment of the Commissioners, the payment of their salaries, the payment of the awards they should make, etc.

In other cases, not identical but analogous, the Congress of the United States has been called upon to take the same action. But the problem solved on these occasions was different in a very important particular from that to be solved now. The responsibility in the case of Spain, under the treaty of 1819, was limited to \$5,000,000. That in the case of Mexico, under the treaty of 1848, was limited to \$3,250,000. And in all the other cases — such as the distribution of the \$80,000 of the *Virginius* indemnity, and of the \$15,500,000 of the Geneva award — it was limited to the amounts respectively paid in cash by Spain and Great Britain. In the case of Spain under the treaty of peace of 1898 the responsibility had no limits fixed, and was indefinite. It might be \$16,000,000; it might be \$40,000,000; it might be still more.

The Congress of the United States, especially the House of Representatives, which had had nothing to do with the conclusion of the treaty of peace, hesitated considerably before doing anything, and hesitated with reason. About three years were spent in protracted debate upon different propositions, four or five in number, presented in the House and in the Senate. On March 2, 1901, in that haste which renders legislation secured in this way particularly obnoxious if not dangerous, Congress passed an act, which the President approved immediately, providing for the appointment of "five suitable persons learned in the law, who should constitute a Commission . . . to receive, examine, and adjudicate" claims against Spain which "the United States had agreed to adjudicate and settle." This Commission of five persons, versed in the law, and suitable to the President and to the Senate, proved to consist of ex-Senator William E. Chandler, of New Hampshire, President; Mr. Gerritt J. Diekema, of Michigan; Mr. James Perry Wood, of Ohio; Mr. William A. Maury, of the District of Columbia; and Mr. William L. Chambers, of Alabama. It met at the Depart-

ment of Justice, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, on Monday, April 8, 1901, and officially inaugurated its work. The act of Congress which created it provided that it should last two years and "no longer"; but unfortunately, this wise provision was coupled with another which renders it nugatory. At the end of the two years—during which time men conversant with such business could easily dispose of all the cases justly, satisfactorily, and at very little cost comparatively for the United States—the life of the Commission can be revived for six months, then for another six months, and so on indefinitely, unless stopped by Congress. A rumor is prevalent that the Commission itself entertains the expectation that it will live five years; and nothing in the world, except Congress, can prevent a repetition of the spectacle presented by the United States and Spanish Claims Commission of 1871, which consumed not less than twelve years in disposing of a docket of only 140 cases, about one-half of which were either withdrawn, or consolidated with others, or thrown back again into the channels of diplomacy.

The expense which the United States will have to incur, especially if the life of the Commission is extended, will be appalling. If it proves in the end, as anticipated by many, that the efforts of the Commission tend primarily toward minimizing the pecuniary responsibility of the United States on account of these claims, the practical result for the Treasury and for the American tax-payers will be about the same. It does not make much difference to the Treasury of the United States, or to the American tax-payers, whether the money of the American people is expended in paying the just claims of American citizens which the President relinquished, through "generosity" to Spain and in consideration of vast acquisitions of territory, or in paying the salaries and expenses, no doubt well earned and legitimate, of the new Commission. At any rate, it is certain that the Commission will have to apply for more money in the next session of Congress, and that, if it does not obtain it, it will be bankrupted. The amount appropriated is \$50,000 per year; and the expenses, at least for this first year of its life, will perhaps double that amount.¹

¹ Five Commissioners at \$5,000 each per year; one clerk for each Commissioner at \$1,200 per year; a Secretary at \$8,500 per year; an Assistant Attorney-General at \$5,000 per year; two assistants to the Assistant Attorney-General at \$2,400 each per year; a clerk and interpreter to the Assistant Attorney-General at \$1,800 per year—these make a total of \$46,100 in salaries alone. No messengers are accounted for in this amount. The Secretary, who, as in all cases of this kind, is the one most heavily burdened and the least rewarded, is not allowed an assistant. Add to this amount the rent of the house, \$3,000 per year, and the balance left of the whole appropriation

Be that as it may, no well-wisher of the Government of the United States will hesitate to express an ardent hope that the labors of this Commission will prove to be for the honor and credit of the Republic.

The Commission has started with a thorough misconception of its purposes and of the scope of its authority. It seems to regard itself as a court, and not as a board of audit. It appears to think that it is a common law court, having common law jurisdiction; that the prosecution of the claims before it is the prosecution of common law actions; and that nothing can come before it except through the channels of common law procedure. In reality, if it is a court, it is only a court of equity, which has been commanded to set aside technicalities, and to obey only the broad dictates of equity and public international law. It seems also to believe that it has extra-territorial powers, for, instead of getting testimony in foreign countries through letters rogatory, as the courts of the United States do,¹ it intends to send commissioners to Cuba, and to give them power to summon witnesses. It wishes, furthermore, to subject perjurers in Cuba to prosecution and punishment, not under the laws of Cuba, but under those of the United States. It has gone so far as to give itself power, under one of its rules, to summon claimants residing in a foreign country to appear before it in Washington, as if it actually possessed authority to serve writs outside the jurisdiction of the United States.

If the fairness and impartiality of the Commissioners were not far above suspicion, the conclusion might be drawn that they were inspired with the vulgar prejudice, discredited though it is by the United States Government itself, that the claims which they have to adjudicate and settle are fraudulent. As these claims were one of the causes of the war, and as this country would not have gone to war with Spain to cause frauds to be consummated, the slander of the imputation would bear more hardly against the Government of the United States than against the claimants.

It is absolutely certain that the negotiators of the treaty of peace, when framing article VII of that instrument, and thereby giving a more formal expression to the arrangement which had been consummated about four months before, in the peace protocol signed at Washington on August 12, 1898, did not think for a moment that they were laying

is \$900. As the house has been repaired and its plumbing modernized, and as heavy expenses have also been incurred in furniture, etc., the Commission will be in a bad plight if Congress does not come to the rescue.

¹ See Revised Statutes, section 875.

the foundation upon which such a High Tribunal should be eventually built. They did not contemplate the institution of a court having jurisdiction to take up the said claims *de novo*; to change them from being claims against Spain into claims against the United States; to place them upon the Procrustean bed of the forms and technicalities of the common law of England; to discuss again the principles upon which they were founded, prosecuted, and diplomatically pressed, three years before the war, by the State Department; and to reverse the action of the latter, if so deemed proper, upon an interpretation of the international law of the case different from the interpretation which the State Department had chosen to entertain and adhere to, crippling thereby the transaction by which the United States inaugurated the era of territorial acquisitions beyond the sea. But the creation of such a monstrosity would not, after all, be anything but a further illustration of Mr. Sidney Webster's remark, above quoted. It would be a new "unintended result," which the people of this country have been called upon to contemplate since the memorable day on which Spain, the lawful sovereign of Cuba, was ordered by the United States to vacate her own territory.

If article VII of the treaty of peace with Spain is understood, as it should be, according to its spirit, and even according to the strict literal meaning of its words — "The United States will adjudicate and settle the claims of its citizens against Spain relinquished in this article" — no possibility seems to exist of including in the list of the claims which are to fall under the jurisdiction of this Commission any one which was not on file or in some way inchoated in the State Department of the United States previous to December 10, 1898, when the relinquishment thereof was formally made, or, more properly still, previous to August 12, 1898, when the agreement to relinquish the said claims in exchange for territorial acquisitions was consummated.

Under the construction which seems to have been placed upon the words occurring in the first part of the article, "all claims . . . that may have arisen since the beginning of the late insurrection in Cuba, and prior to the exchange of ratifications of the present treaty," the question arises whether the claims presented subsequently to August 12, 1898, or December 10, 1898, or between the latter date and April 11, 1899, when the ratifications of the treaty were exchanged, can properly be adjudicated and settled by the Commission. It is also open to discussion whether claims against Spain which may have arisen between the limit *a quo*, namely February 24, 1895, and the limit *ad quem*, namely, April 11, 1899, not in Cuba, but in the Philippine Islands, or

in Porto Rico, or in peninsular Spain herself, also fall properly under the jurisdiction of the Commission. A construction of this kind, even if merely attempted, would certainly be welcomed by those who have some interest in the perpetuation of the life of the Commission, with all the advantages derived therefrom, such as the enjoyment of large salaries, the protracted exercise of authority, etc.; and it would certainly be another "unintended result" of the arduous work of the negotiators of the treaty of peace.

If article VII of that instrument is construed, as it must be, in close connection with all the facts that were disclosed by the diplomatic correspondence, and by the discussions in Congress which preceded it, and have a bearing upon it, the conclusion is inevitable that all these claims of citizens of the United States against Spain — for wrongs done to their persons or property, from February 24, 1895, to April 11, 1899 — have to be taken up, not *de novo*, but in the condition in which they stood, in the Department of State, in the moment in which the Commission was organized and began its labors. The position that each case has to be started before the Commission *de novo*, as if nothing had been done in it during the diplomatic discussion which preceded the war, and that the doings of the State Department during that period of discussion can now be revised and reviewed by the Commission, and approved or disapproved by it as it may choose, is absolutely untenable. The diplomatic organ of the sovereign which is called "The United States of America" is only and exclusively the Department of State; and what the Department of State did in this line cannot be undone without manifest improvidence, and even lack of official courtesy, by any other organ of the same sovereign, whether an Executive Department, a Court, or a Commission.

If International Commissions of arbitration have the power to overrule, when they deem proper, the diplomatic action of the United States or of any other sovereign who is party to them, it is only because the said power is expressly given to them by agreement of the sovereigns who concurred to create the Commissions. It is not improper for a Government to allow, for the high purposes of international peace and arbitration, its own action to be reviewed and possibly overruled by a third party. It would, however, be absolutely improper and anarchical that a commission, appointed to assess the amounts of money due to each claimant in cases which the Government presented and pressed against another Government so far as to secure from the latter, in payment of the same, a cession of territory, should be permitted to come

and sit in judgment upon the action of its own Government, to discuss the principles which the latter thought it fit to maintain, and eventually to overrule them. It was, no doubt, permissible for Mr. William E. Chandler, when in the Senate of the United States, to attack with peculiar vehemence the refusal of the administration, under both Mr. Cleveland and Mr. McKinley, to acknowledge the belligerent status of the Cubans; but it would be exceedingly improper for the same gentleman, when President of the Commission, to try to enforce his own convictions, and defeat, through them, claims which are good only because the Government of the United States had the misfortune not to agree with him in his views upon the subject.

Let me put it more plainly. Many of the claims which the Commission had to settle are founded upon the destruction of American property in Cuba at the hands of the insurgents. If these claims had any value, and if the Government of the United States could properly take them up to the extent of making them a *casus belli*, it was no doubt because of its refusal to acknowledge the belligerency of the insurgents. In the eyes of the United States they were nothing more nor less than a mob, and therefore the Spanish Government could be called to account for their action. But if the enlightened President of the Commission continues to believe that Mr. Cleveland and Mr. McKinley were wrong in closing their eyes to the fact, clear to his own, that the Cubans were belligerents, what will become of these claims? What will become also of the claims founded upon the destruction of property by the Spaniards? Both parties being belligerents, no just claim can be based upon the exercise, by the one or the other, of the supreme power which the necessities of war inevitably bring.

Would it not have been better, in view of a possibility of this kind, and for the sake of saving money, time, and credit, to try to settle this point in the first place, by the enunciation of a guiding principle? The thing could have been done very easily, if the Commission had not adhered to its erroneous belief that it is a court of common law, and that it cannot allow deviations from the rules of pleading and the forms observed in such courts.

There is a case before the Commission in which the claimant and his lawyer made an effort, although in vain, to have this matter settled. The case is very small pecuniarily, involving no more than \$3,000. It is founded exclusively upon the destruction of the claimant's property by a band of insurgents, on September 5, 1895. The case was presented to the State Department on April 17, 1899, and the State Department

had on its files all the evidence relating thereto. Great pains were taken to obtain correct copies of everything that had been presented to the consideration of the Secretary of State. A petition was drawn and printed, giving frankly and minutely all the facts of the case. The certificate of naturalization of the claimant, the title papers of his property, Spanish certificates showing his neutrality, and other papers showing that the destruction was made by the insurgents were appended as "exhibits." Had the Commission so wished, the whole question could have been settled at once and without difficulty. The decision in this case would have served as a precedent for all others. In the event of the decision being that Spain was not responsible for the wrongs done by the insurgents, much less for wrongs done to Americans who were not neutral but acted in more or less direct connivance with the insurgents, about two-thirds of the claims would have been eliminated from the docket. But the learned ex-Congressman who represents the Attorney-General's office before the Claims Commission did not hesitate to declare, at the public meeting of May 22, 1901, that if such ideas as those expressed by the lawyer in the case were to find favor before the Commission, he would "pack up his books and return to his home in the West." Of course, before this irrefutable argument all opposition vanished.

It was bad enough for the Commission to call itself "The Spanish Treaty Claims Commission," without specifying to which Spanish treaty, or to which claims, it intended to refer — whether to a treaty concluded between Spain and the United States or to one between Spain and any other power; whether to claims under the recent treaty of peace, or to those under any other treaty with Spain. As it happens that in addition to the Spanish-American treaty of peace, out of which "The Spanish Treaty Claims Commission" has sprung into existence, there is another Spanish-American treaty, which survived the war, or was renewed after it, and refers to claims and indemnities — namely, the treaty of February 17, 1834 — the unsuitability of the name adopted by the Commission appears still more flagrant. But certainly it was worse for the Commission to begin its labors, as it did, under the belief, to which it has unflinchingly held, that the claims which it has to adjudicate and settle are claims of individual citizens of the United States against the United States. The learned ex-Congressman who represents the United States before the Commission has gone so far, in his zeal to maintain this point, as to move the dismissal of petitions on the ground that they "lacked proper caption and title." If this means anything, it means

that petitions stating a claim which the United States enforced against Spain at the point of the bayonet are to be dismissed, no matter how just, because the petitioner did not write at the top of his paper the inaccurate caption "Spanish Treaty Claims Commission," and the erroneous title "A. B., claimant, vs. the United States"!

All this is wrong and untenable. The claims to be adjudicated and settled by the Commission are not claims of individual citizens of the United States, but claims of the Government of the United States, or, in other words, national claims. They are not claims against the United States but claims against Spain, in which the United States has been from the beginning plaintiff, not defendant. That this fact was recognized by Congress when creating the Commission appears clearly from the language of the act approved March 2, 1901. It refers to these claims not as claims against the United States, but as claims against Spain. And how could it be otherwise? They do not arise out of any injury done by the United States to the persons or property of her own citizens, but out of injuries done by Spain, or her authorities, to citizens of the United States, in violation of rights secured them by treaty or by the general principles of public international law.

As claims against Spain they were presented by the State Department to the consideration of the Spanish Government, and on some occasions, as for instance in the Ansley case, the language used in their presentation was rather forcible.¹ As claims against Spain they were discussed with that nation, and in more than one instance, when the defence made by Spain was not deemed sufficient—as, for example, in the case of the killing of Charles Govin, a young correspondent of the "Key West Equator Democrat," who was captured by the Spaniards and hacked to pieces with a machete—Spain was not treated with leniency.² As claims against Spain, which Spain had refused to settle in a manner satisfactory to the United States, they were taken up by Congress and by the President, and were made, as officially declared, one of the causes of the war between the United States and Spain. And as claims against Spain the responsibility thereof was assumed by the United States when the peace was made, because, as has been stated, the President desired to make an exhibition of signal generosity toward Spain, and to acquire Porto Rico and other islands. Thus it might be said with perfect propriety that these claims of the United States against Spain have been paid by Spain, and that the only thing

¹ Mr. Olney to Señor Dupuy de Lome, September 7, 1895.

² Mr. Rockhill to Mr. Lee, August 18 and 20 and October 8, 1896.

to be done now by the United States in relation to them is to assess to each claimant in money the particular share which belongs to him of the lump sum disbursed by Spain in the shape of territory and sovereign rights.

According to this view of the case, the duty of the Commission is exactly the same as that which devolved on the officials who distributed the *Virginibus* indemnity, paid in a lump by Spain, or on the Commissions, parallel with the present one, which adjusted the claims, assumed by the United States, of citizens of the United States, for injuries done to them by Spain and by Mexico, respectively. It cannot be doubted that if there had been no war these "claims of our citizens for injuries done to their persons and property during the late insurrection in Cuba," as Mr. Secretary Day said, would have been either collected in full, or compromised, or submitted to arbitration as claims of the United States, and that in the case of submission to arbitration the Government of the United States would have appointed an agent or advocate whose duty it would have been to defend the claimants before the arbitrators.

Under the strange transformation or transmutation of the United States, which the Commission wishes, from plaintiffs into defendants, the claimants are placed in the awkward and undesired necessity, practically hopeless, of fighting against their own Government, from which they have received no injury, and against which they have never raised, and do not wish now to raise, their voices. Some of the claimants, who are now filling in Cuba and elsewhere positions of honor and trust under the Government of the United States, are placed by it in the puzzling alternative either of violating section 5498 of the Revised Statutes, or of giving up their claims; because, if these claims are claims against the United States, and the claimants press them, they are liable to indictment and punishment by fine and imprisonment. Some other claimants see themselves in the embarrassing position, which in some cases may be cruel, of being unable to raise any money upon their claims; because, under section 3477 of the Revised Statutes, they are not assignable if they are claims against the United States.

But the situation in which the Department of State is left by the transmutation is infinitely worse. That Department is the only constitutional and recognized organ of the Government of the United States in these matters,¹ and it will see itself, nevertheless, in the almost intolerable position of having its diplomatic action inquired into, criti-

¹ See section 202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

cised, and perhaps reversed and rebuked by five citizens of the United States, who, as such, are bound in all cases, when acting officially, to respect what their Government has done, and to abide by it. The theory of the courtesy which is due by one branch of the Government, no matter how high, to another branch, was admirably explained in the passage quoted by Dr. Wharton in his "Digest of the International Law of the United States."¹ With how much more reason must it be preserved between temporary boards or committees — created for special purposes, and always of secondary character — and the regular and permanent organs of the sovereign.²

Another point of importance is still to be considered. The claims which this Commission has to adjudicate and settle are private property, as much so as houses and lands, which the Government in the use of its right condemned, it might be said, for public use. But as no property in the United States can be condemned without indemnification, this property of the claimants, which the claimants would have recovered from Spain if the United States had not exonerated her from her responsibility, has to be paid by the United States. The Government of the United States, when dealing with the claims of its citizens, can, of course, abandon them, or compromise them, or consent to their submission to arbitration, or relinquish them *in toto*, as was done in this case, for some valuable consideration or even without it; but all this can be done only, as in the case of houses and lands taken and condemned for public use, upon payment of the proper indemnification. The following authorities confirm this position:

"A release by the United States to a foreign Government, in part consideration of a cession of territory, of an indebtedness to an American citizen, acknowledged to be valid, is a taking of private property for public use."³

"Should the Government of the United States, either by neglecting in pressing a claim against a foreign Government, or by extinguishing it as an equivalent for

¹ Vol. ii, p. 220.

² It is to be noticed that no claim against a foreign Government is admitted or pressed by the State Department without the approval of the Attorney-General of the United States, represented to that effect by an officer who is called the "Solicitor" of the Department, or, more properly, "The Examiner of Claims." This officer and his assistants are appointed by the Attorney-General, belong to his office, and are paid out of the funds thereof. The spectacle, therefore, of an Assistant Attorney-General trying to undo in the Commission what another Assistant Attorney-General has done in the State Department, and of both things being done in the name of the United States and invoking her name, would certainly be strange.

³ The United States Court of Claims, in Meade's case, 2 Nott. & H., 224. See Dr. Wharton's "Digest of the International Law of the United States," vol. ii, page 711.

concessions from such Government, impair the claimant's rights, it is bound to duly compensate such claimant."¹

"The case of sovereign power lawfully applied to the extinguishment of a private claim is without a doubt a case of national obligation to pay an equivalent to the private proprietor."²

To come now, through an intricate machinery of technicalities and legal niceties, to pay practically nothing, or very little, for property which was successfully used in the purchase of new territories, would be glaring dishonesty.

J. I. RODRIGUEZ.

¹ Dr. Wharton's "Digest," above cited, vol. ii, page 566.

² American State Papers, Foreign Relations, vol. iv, page 709.

PACIFICATION BY ARSON.

THE subjugation of the two South African republics by the British is by this time as complete as the speeches of Cabinet ministers, in and out of Parliament, can make it. Several months have passed since Lord Roberts, being no longer required in the field, returned to London to take up the position of Commander-in-Chief, the chief function of which office appears to be the opening of numerous military bazaars. The highest authority of all may be quoted to establish the comfortable theory that the Boer War is now an affair of ancient history, for the King himself has already distributed the war medals won on the veldt and in the Government House at Cape Town — an award usually made at intervals of from twelve months to twenty years after the close of a campaign. These facts place beyond doubt the actuality of the British ownership of the mines and the territory which Lord Salisbury and his government did not seek, but which, when once reluctantly acquired, they feel it their painful duty to retain. There has been no such convincing proof of possession since the time of the Irishman who, when told that his house had been blown away, replied that it was impossible, for he had the key in his pocket.

It is possible, however, that there will be supplementary distributions of war medals, as there have been supplementary dispatches of troops and supplementary financial estimates. It would be a cruel injustice if the 250,000 men still wearily tramping up and down and around kopjes were to receive less honor than has been gained by the City Imperial Volunteers for the heroic excursion which has restored to the Corporation of London something of its former reputation as a source and inspirer of martial prowess. Indeed, why should not such a distribution of medals be made a regular annual celebration? It is likely that, for several years to come, whoever may happen to be commanding in South Africa will be able to spare a sufficient detachment to make a creditable showing at the Horse Guards on Decoration Day. There is, of course, the obvious objection that the troops now on duty are only employed on "police work" — the war itself, says Mr. Chamberlain, "has long ceased to be a war in

the true sense of the word"—and that it is not usual to bestow war medals upon police constables of any grade. Police work in South Africa seems, however, to be at least as dangerous as real war; for the losses suffered by British troops during June exceeded the average monthly toll paid since the beginning of the campaign. Moreover, the bill of expenses continues to mount up steadily at the rate of more than \$50,000 an hour.

The British Government is apparently resigned to this outlay in men and money as an "inevitable" dispensation of Providence, which it would be impious to attempt to check by any processes of investigation and reflection. After all, you cannot hope to engage in missionary enterprises of this or any other kind without having to make sacrifices. Outsiders might have supposed that the recent renewal of the invasion of Cape Colony, together with the absolute ineffectiveness of the British control of any part of the "annexed" Republics at a distance from the railway line, would have suggested at least the modification of the official view; but they little appreciate the strength of the present administration—at any rate, in holding to any theory which it has deliberately avowed. The war was over last September; it is over still. If facts are inconsistent with this theory, so much the worse for the facts. The pen of a governor-general and the tongue of a Cabinet minister are mightier than the sword; and if they cannot end a war, then, in the name of the Colonial Office, what can?

But, although to the British Government such incidents as are reported almost daily in the papers are only stages in the beneficent and orderly evolution which is presently to make "Rule Britannia" as popular in every Dutch village in South Africa as in the public-houses of the Strand, the present situation appears hardly so satisfactory to observers of a less fatalistic and optimistic temper. That the campaign which was to have gone down in history as the Six Weeks' War should at the end of twenty months be making such exhausting demands upon the resources of the conqueror, justifies the hesitation of those who venture timidly to suggest that there still remain problems to be solved. In particular, the attitude of the Dutch in Cape Colony is a significant symptom. It is within the mark to say that this section of the colonial population is far more disaffected to British rule to-day than when the first shot was fired. The actual number of Cape Dutch on commando against the British forces is larger than at any previous period; and the course of events, instead of breaking down their opposition, has turned them into irreconcilables. Somehow the exhibition of invincible British power, which was expected

to conciliate, has really alienated. For example, the Rev. Andrew Murray, one of the most influential leaders of the Dutch Reformed Church and an author of theological literature that has gained a wide circulation throughout the English-speaking world, recently refused to have anything to do with any peace proposals that did not recognize the independence of the two Republics. When the war began, Mr. Murray had the reputation of being much more friendly to British than to Dutch influences.

If the Liberals had won a majority at the general election last fall, no doubt their success at the polls would have been quoted as a sufficient explanation of this revival of anti-British sentiment. "Behold," it would have been said, "how the rebels are taking courage from the prospects of a pro-Boer English ministry." As it is, a solution of the difficulty must be sought elsewhere. Quite recently the publication of a Government paper has afforded considerable illumination to those who have eyes to see. It is entitled: "South Africa. Return of Buildings burnt in each month from June, 1900 to January, 1901, including Farm Buildings, Mills, Cottages, and Hovels. Presented to Parliament by Command of His Majesty." It is perhaps necessary to explain to readers who live under a republican form of government that in this instance the "command of His Majesty" actually means the persistence of certain members of the Opposition in the House of Commons in demanding information on this topic. The return applies only to the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, or, as it is humorously described here, the "Orange River Colony." Mr. Brodrick promised a return of the farm burnings in Cape Colony also, but it has not yet appeared.

The summary prefixed to the details of this report deserves careful attention as an illustration of the brilliant mathematical talent which the War Office brings to bear upon such an intricate problem as an exercise in simple addition. It would be interesting to know how many hours were spent upon the remarkable calculating feat which is here reproduced verbatim from the official return:

SUMMARY OF NUMBERS OF BUILDINGS BURNT IN EACH MONTH.

| | | | |
|---|-----|---------------------|-----|
| June, 1900..... | 2 | November, 1900..... | 226 |
| July, 1900..... | 3 | December, 1900..... | 6 |
| August, 1900..... | 12 | January, 1901 | 3 |
| September, 1900 | 99 | | |
| October, 1900..... | 189 | | 552 |
| Dates not known, but probably before November, 1900 | | 90 | |
| Total destroyed..... | | | 634 |

When simple addition proves such a fearsome task, it is only natural

that even simple enumeration should cause perplexity. Accordingly, it is not so very startling to discover that the total of 634, gained by the mysterious processes operating in the above table, is slightly below the total that will be reached by any one who takes the trouble to count the individual cases recorded in the body of the return. As a further example of inaccuracy, it may be mentioned that, although the summary ceases with January, 1901, the return itself makes mention of one dwelling-house and three farms burnt in February, 1901, and one dwelling-house burnt in March, 1901. Carelessness of compilation is equally manifest in four entries in the Venterburg district, where the reason alleged for the destruction of houses owned by Widow Erasmus, Widow Fourie, Widow Vonburghen, and Widow Eramus, respectively, is that the owners were on commando! The value of the return is minimized by several evident omissions, which are easily discovered by a comparison of the details with well-substantiated reports from authoritative sources. For example, a proclamation issued at Bloemfontein, in June, 1900, gives the names of thirty-eight persons whose farms were to be burnt by order of Lord Roberts. Not one of these cases is to be found in the return. The total would be considerably augmented if one were permitted to add to it cases reported from time to time by the correspondents of English newspapers of all shades of political opinion. These correspondents were themselves present at the scenes which they described.

But even if we assume that the official return is a complete account of the devastation wrought in these two states, its revelations are enough to indicate the actual nature of the policy of the British commanders, or rather of the British Government, by whose instructions the generals in the field have throughout been closely bound. There is an impression in many quarters that such devastation, while greatly to be deplored, and while causing much distress to its victims, was nevertheless justifiable. It is argued that treachery must receive stern and rigorous punishment, and that, even where this offence has not been committed, the laws of war justify an invading army in the adoption of harsh measures. Before we proceed to consider the report in detail, it may be worth while to state what are the usages of war in this respect among civilized nations. At the Hague Convention, England was among the powers which signed the following provisions, in the section entitled "On Military Authority over Hostile Territory":

"Article 44.—Any compulsion of the population of occupied territory to take part in military operations against its own country is prohibited."

"Article 45.—Any pressure on the population of occupied territory to take the oath of allegiance to the hostile power is prohibited."

Article 46.—Family honor and rights, individual lives and private property, as well as religious convictions and liberty, must be respected. Private property cannot be confiscated.

Article 47.—Pillage is absolutely prohibited.

Article 50.—No general penalty, pecuniary or otherwise, can be inflicted on the population on account of the acts of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively responsible.”¹

Moreover, Sir John Ardagh, one of the British representatives at the Hague, made the following proposal on behalf of his own country:

“Nothing in this chapter shall be considered as diminishing or denying the rights belonging to the people of an invaded country to fulfil their duty of opposing the invaders by the most energetic patriotic resistance, and by all permitted means.”²

It has been argued that the provisions of the Hague Convention do not apply to the present case, inasmuch as the Transvaal Republic was not a party to them. This plea is particularly disingenuous in view of the fact that President Kruger wished to be represented at the Conference, and afterward wished to sign the Convention, but was prevented by England, on the ground that the South African Republic was not an absolutely sovereign and independent state. Would this excuse have been accepted if the Transvaal had been strong enough to invade England, and had pursued there such a policy as that of which she has herself been the victim? At any rate, the Hague Convention shows clearly enough what the leading civilized powers of the world regard as limitations to the aggressions of an invader, and what England herself regards as restrictions that should be observed by any European power that might obtain a lodgment upon her own shores.

A further expression of Great Britain's own deliberate judgment in this matter is to be found in the manual of military law, known as the Military Red-Book, which is published annually by the British Government. The following passages from the edition of 1899, in which year the present war broke out, bear directly upon the questions now in dispute:

“As the object of war is confined to disabling the enemy, the infliction of any injuries beyond that which is required to produce disability is needless cruelty.

The general principle is that in the mode of carrying on war no greater harm shall be done to the enemy than necessity requires for the purpose of bringing him to terms. This principle excludes gratuitous barbarities, and every description of cruelty and insult which serves only to exasperate the sufferings or to increase the hatred of the enemy, without weakening his strength or tending to procure his submission.

The general principles of the customs of war applicable to the enemy's property

¹ See F. W. Holls' “The Peace Conference at the Hague,” pp. 447, 449.

² *Ib.*, p. 143.

are shortly these: The object of war is compensation for an injury. To attain this object it is lawful to take from the enemy everything that conduces to his means of resistance, but it is unlawful to do his property any intentional injury which does not tend to bring the war to an end.

An invader is said to be in military occupation of so much of a country as is wholly abandoned by the forces of the enemy. The occupation must be real, not nominal; a paper occupation is infinitely more objectionable in its character and effects than a paper blockade."¹

In the light of these principles, let us examine the official return of farm burnings as recently presented to Parliament. We find that only a few entries accuse treachery. The abuse of the white flag is alleged in eleven cases only. Murder is charged in five instances. A few cases are reported of fighting after the oath had been taken. In the majority of cases, however, the reasons stated come under one of the following heads: (1) Laying waste country used as base by enemy. (2) Harboring Boers. (3) Owner on commando. This last plea has been too much even for Conservative newspapers that have been enthusiastic supporters of the Government. "The Standard" asks whether the allies in 1814 would have had the right to burn the shop of a Paris tradesman because the owner was carrying a musket in one of the emperor's regiments; and "The St. James's Gazette," which not long ago was advocating unmitigated Weylerism, declared it to be an unheard-of thing in civilized warfare to endeavor to compel the surrender of the soldiers of a belligerent power by inflicting individual penalties, and denounced such cases as "an outrage on the conventions of war." Among miscellaneous entries to be found in the report under the heading "Reasons for Destruction" may be quoted the following:

"Accidentally destroyed by lyddite fire.

Farm near where telegraph wire was cut.

Burnt evidently by mistake.

Men on commando in the immediate neighborhood, notice having previously been sent to the laager that their houses would be burned if they did not come in, or were not at their houses by the date.

By reason of its utility to the Boers.

Used by Boer outposts.

Troop train derailed and fired on two miles E. of Pan.

Witpoort had been an enemy's stronghold for some considerable time.

Coetzar being seen with two others, who shot a man of 5th Lancers.

This house was burnt without orders by some one unknown.

To destroy mealies, etc., stored in house; owner on commando.

Harboring Boers and grinding corn for Boers at the mill."

In a few instances no reason whatever is assigned. Among these is

¹ Quoted in a speech given in the House of Commons on April 2, 1901, by Mr. Thomas Shaw, late Solicitor-General for Scotland.

the following entry, which records an instance of incendiarism for which the British Government has already had to pay a heavy price:

| District. | Name of Village or Farm. | Name of owner. | Date of Destruction. | Reasons for Destruction. |
|------------------|--------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Rhenoster River. | | Christian de Wet | | |

The facts recorded in the return of farm burnings need to be supplemented by some account of certain official proclamations made on the subject at various periods during the war. In June, 1900, Lord Roberts issued a proclamation, the influence of which in embittering the opposition of the Dutch can scarcely be over-estimated. This announcement was especially directed against attempts to damage railways and telegraph wires — methods of warfare which are perfectly legitimate when these railways and telegraphs are being used for military purposes. It ordered the destruction of houses and farms in the vicinity of any place where such damage was done. It went on to say:

“As a further precautionary measure, the military director has been authorized to order that one or more residents selected by him from each district shall from time to time personally accompany the trains while passing through the district.”

This proviso, unknown in the warfare of the last half-century, except during the Franco-German conflict, when its practice by the Germans was universally reprobated by leading authorities on international law as well as by general public sentiment, was withdrawn on July 27. The order for the destruction of neighboring buildings remained, however, in force, as is shown by several items in the return. It is scarcely necessary to argue that this policy is entirely unjustified by the laws of war. The property destroyed was not being defended by a hostile armed force, nor were its owners guilty of complicity in the mischief for which punishment was thus inflicted. When a sudden descent is made upon the railway line by a band of Boers which has perhaps ridden over from a post twenty miles away, the local residents are no more accountable for the attack than if they lived in New York.

In a letter dated September 2, Lord Roberts admitted having ordered that, in cases of damage to trains and railways, all neighboring houses should be burnt and farms for ten miles around should be denuded of their provisions, cattle, etc. He lamented the necessity for such measures, but declared himself obliged to resort to them “by the evidently firm resolve on the part of yourself [Gen. Botha] and the burghers to continue the war.” This embodies an extraordinary doctrine. It means

that as soon as the commander of one of the contending armies thinks it desirable, for political or other reasons, that the war should come to an end, he is empowered to pronounce it over, and his *ipse dixit* has thereupon all the authority of the verdict of an international board of arbitration. If the foe persists in his resistance after the proclamation of a nominal annexation, he may be made the victim of a policy which would not be permitted if there were still a state of war. We can see here the fatal results of the blind theory that the occupation of Pretoria, which was only one incident in a long campaign, was to be interpreted as the crowning stroke of the whole war. It seems to have been argued that inasmuch as the occupation of London by a foreign foe would cripple England, *ergo* the occupation of Pretoria must cripple the Transvaal. Whatever happened, it was necessary to "save the face" of the ministers and generals who accepted this theory; and accordingly measures have been adopted which have made the territory, supposed to be conquered, more hostile to British influence to-day than it was a year ago. It is obvious that the real reason for the farm-burning was the inefficiency of the British troops. It is the penalty that non-combatants have to pay for the "mobility" of De Wet.

For several months the policy of the wholesale destruction of farms and houses was carried out as illustrated in the return. On November 18, two days after the publication of a telling protest by Mr. John Morley, who quoted a heart-breaking description of a typical scene of farm-burning, Lord Roberts issued an order intended, as he put it, to clear up "misunderstanding" on the subject. The text of his order is as follows:

"As there appears to be some misunderstanding with reference to the burning of farms and the breaking of dams, the Commander-in-Chief wishes the following to be the line on which the general officers commanding are to act. No farm is to be burned except for an act of treachery, or when troops have been fired on from premises, or as punishment for breaking telegraph or railway lines, or when they have been used as bases of operation for raiding, and then only with the direct consent of the general officer commanding, which is to be given in writing. The mere fact of a burgher being absent on commando is on no account to be taken as a reason for the burning of his house."

It appears, then, that "misunderstanding by British officers" should have been inscribed in the return in the numerous instances in which "owners on commando" is actually entered as the reason for destruction. No doubt the explanation has brought much comfort to the sufferers. Unfortunately, the "misunderstanding," once started, was difficult to check; for on page 8 of the return are recorded twenty-five instances of farm

burning in the Frankfort district because the owner was on commando, and the date of these burnings is November 25.

The new proclamation is not itself free from possibilities of ambiguity. May not some officers, untrained in observing the niceties of language, be in danger of interpreting "punishment for breaking telegraph or railway lines" to include "punishment for living near places where telegraphs or railway lines have been broken"? It should be pointed out also that even the permission to burn houses from which troops have been fired on or which have been used as bases of operation for raiding is not in harmony with enlightened principles of military operation. A woman left with her children, and perhaps a few Kaffir servants, in occupation of her farm cannot prevent the use of the buildings by any force that comes along, whether it happen to be Boer or British. If such buildings are turned into a military stronghold, like the famous farm at Hougmont, the case is altered; but the fact that they occasionally provide food or concealment for a passing body of troops is not a sufficient reason for their destruction, in view of all that this involves.

For it must be remembered that the burning of an isolated house upon the veldt carries with it exceptional privation and distress. Pages could easily be filled with illustrative quotations from letters written sometimes by the victims themselves, sometimes by officers and privates who took part in the burning, sometimes by newspaper correspondents who were present. The instance mentioned in Mr. Morley's protest is that of an educated Dutch lady, the daughter of a better-class yeoman who was on commando. The farm was visited several times by British troops, who in some cases bought food and in others stole it. Once a British party removed a wagon, twelve oxen, harness, mealies, etc., for which the lieutenant in charge of the party refused to give a receipt. Another party cleared out what remained in the wagon house, as well as dried fruits, forage, and blankets. A later party inquired whether the owner was on commando, and whether the Boers ever called at the house. The farmer's daughter replied that the Boers had called when they passed. "How could we prevent them, our own people, when we could not keep the soldiers out?" Notice was then given that the farm would be burnt at the end of an hour. The lady's story continues:

"We carried out furniture from the drawing-room and two bedrooms, our piano and sideboard. While we were busy the troops came. They poured something over the floor to make it burn, and soon the dwelling-house and the outside buildings were in flames, and our comfortable home was gone. My mother, our lady friend, and I remained outside amongst the things we had removed and watched the burning. . . . That night we slept out among the furniture, standing on the 'werf,' the wind carry-

ing sparks over our head. Twice during the night the stables caught fire, and twice we got up to put that out, so that we might have some shelter for the next night. Next day we had the stables cleaned and some of our goods carried in there, and there we slept the second night."

The remaining horses and cattle belonging to the farm were taken by the troops, who refused to permit the farmer's family to remain in the stables, insisting that they should go to the nearest town — Winburg, distant three hours' journey — together with seventeen other families which had similarly suffered. They had a house of their own at Winburg, however, and it was promised them that they would be allowed to remain there.

"At ten we were put on an open bullock wagon and were sent into the town, which we reached at half-past seven that night, after having been exposed to the hot sun all day. The major calmly said, ' You are only common working-people and used to such a rough life.' When we got to the town they refused to give us our house, and sent us to the hotel, paying for us. This was on September 20. On the 23d the commandant came to see us, and said we were to go either to Bloemfontein or to the Colony. Should we refuse we would be sent later on with other women in open trucks to Bloemfontein and placed in tents there. These were his orders."

With their characteristic humor the British authorities apply the term "refugees" to the women and children who are corralled in this fashion. The use of the word lends to the operation a comforting suggestion of sympathetic philanthropy. Little by little the truth has been coming out respecting the real character of the charitable institutions known as "refugee camps." On March 8, 1901, the Secretary of State for War, replying to a question by Mr. Ellis, assured him that he need not be under any anxiety about their occupants, for Lord Kitchener had telegraphed that the people in the laagers were all contented and comfortable. Apparently this item of Parliamentary news was not telegraphed back to South Africa; for only five days later Lady Maxwell, wife of the Military Governor of the Transvaal, all unconscious of Mr. Brodrick's satisfaction, sent to the "New York Herald" an appeal for contributions of warm clothing for the Boer women and children in the camps, "many of whom are totally destitute and unable to provide against the cold weather which is now setting in." She went on to say:

"It is in the name of the little children who are living in open tents, without fires and possessing only the scantiest of clothes, that I ask for help. There are something over 22,000 refugees in these camps in the Transvaal alone, all of which are under my husband's (Major-General Maxwell) care. . . . Even if peace should be proclaimed sooner than we hope, it will hardly alter the condition of many of these women, whose husbands have been killed and their homes destroyed by the cruel experiences of war. . . . Contributions of warm clothing addressed to the military gov-

ernor, Pretoria, South Africa, will be most gratefully received and distributed among them."

An English lady, Miss Emily Hobhouse, niece of Lord Hobhouse, has recently returned from a visit to the camps in Cape Colony and the Orange Free State — she was excluded from the Transvaal — to give assistance on behalf of the Committee of the Distress Fund for South African Women and Children. Her report, published in pamphlet form, is a record of the most painful distress.¹ Here is a summary of the result of some of her investigations:

"Miss Hobhouse has enabled us to fill in the picture which the statistics of the death rate in these camps suggested. In the Free State the rate has been about 250 per 1,000 per annum, in the Transvaal 120, while in the Johannesburg camp, above all the fatal wealth of the mines, it was as high as 435. We now know why. The site at Bloemfontein, for example, was badly chosen. The water was a mere solution of typhoid germs, and no shade was available. Women expecting their confinement in a few weeks lay on the ground without mattresses, in tents that leaked. The nightly dew soaked through, and every morning our prisoners had to wring out their clothes. Young babies put into leaky bell tents would catch a chill, sicken, and die. Medical attendance was inadequate. At Bloemfontein there was one nurse to thirty typhoid cases. At Kimberley there was no nurse at all; at Norval's Point no trained nurse, and almost all the cases in hospital had died. . . . Fuel is almost non-existent in these camps, and all the rations, meat, coffee, flour, etc., are served out raw. If the children die of raw food, it is because no fuel is provided."²

Persistent interrogation in Parliament has done a little to mitigate some of these sufferings. For instance, Mr. Brodrick has undertaken to abandon the system by which the wives of Boers still on commando received only half the rations dealt out to those whose husbands had surrendered. On June 17, when the House of Commons was shocked by his revelation of the terrible mortality among children, he announced that the authorities were arranging for the release of those women and children who had friends to receive them. Their places, however, will soon be

¹ In the present state of terrorism in London it has been found impossible to secure a public hall in which Miss Hobhouse can give an account of what she saw in these camps. A meeting was to have been held in the Queen's Hall, under the presidency of the Bishop of Hereford, at which Miss Hobhouse was announced to "describe the needs and condition of the women and children." The engagement was cancelled by the lessee of the hall, owing to his apprehension of violence on the part of those who clamored for war to vindicate the rights of free speech for the Outlanders of Johannesburg. Attempts made to hold a meeting in other halls have similarly failed. At Oxford, however, Miss Hobhouse has received a sympathetic hearing at the Liberal Club, as well as at a private meeting at the Master's Lodge at Balliol College. In conveying to her the thanks of the meeting, the Master of Balliol said that, without expressing any opinion upon the political aspects of the war, which Miss Hobhouse did not desire to discuss, they must all agree that the condition of things which she had described to them must be stopped.

² The London "Morning Leader," June 19, 1901.

filled by substitutes; for newspapers in different parts of England and Scotland are still publishing letters from officers and privates describing the burning of farms for reasons which show that the unfortunate "misunderstanding" has not yet been corrected. According to an official statement made in the House of Lords by Lord Raglan on July 15, and cabled to the New York newspapers of the following day, the whites at present in the concentration camps number 14,624 men, 27,711 women, and 43,075 children; and the mortality for the month of June was 63 men, 138 women, and 576 children. These figures are an interesting comment on the verses in which, at the beginning of the war, Mr. Swinburne indignantly accused the Boers of waging war "with women and with weanlings."

And what are the results of this policy of devastation upon the progress of the war and toward the conciliation of the people who are to be transformed by it into loyal British subjects? Its success has been as brilliant and immediate as was that of Lord Cornwallis, when by his burning of American homesteads he revived the spirit of the revolted colonists and rallied them by thousands to Washington's flag. The wanton burning of De Wet's farm, for which there was no justification in any of the rules of war before or after the Hague Conference, has turned into an irreconcilable the man who has outwitted for months the flower of British generalship. All sorts of rumors have been circulated respecting the intentions of General Louis Botha; but the statement most in accord with the known facts is that of Dr. Poutsma, to whom Botha is reported to have replied, when asked whether he meant to surrender: "No, not after the way they have treated us — after the burning of our farms and the deporting of our women. I would rather be shot." How the average Boer looks at the matter may be judged from another extract from the letter of the lady quoted by Mr. John Morley:

"One of the men asked where we intended sleeping that night. I said if I had burned the house, I would have known where to have gone and what to have done. Others said, ' You have to thank Presidents Steyn and Kruger for this. Why do they not come and give in? Why do they go about like robbers? ' So we said, ' They will never give in; they are fighting for their country, and you are fighting women because you know they will not shoot back.' We also asked, would they give in if we were fighting them and started burning their houses and sending women out in the open veldt without a morsel of food because their husbands, fathers, and brothers would not give in."

The demand for unconditional surrender is made to-day by Lord Salisbury as it was made more than a hundred years ago by Lord North. But there is no response to it yet from the concentration camps. If

peace is to be gained by these methods they must be made sterner still. For Miss Hobhouse reports :

"Those who are suffering most keenly, and who have lost most, either of their children by death or their possessions by fire and sword, such as these reconcentrated women in the camps, have the most conspicuous patience, and never express a wish that their men should be the ones to give way. It must be fought out now, they think, to the bitter end."

Who can doubt that over the ruins of many a charred farm there has been taken such a vow as that by which the child Hannibal was pledged? Miss Hobhouse relates how, in one of the camps, the mothers had the corpses of their dead babies photographed for their husbands to see when they return from Ceylon. When the new British subject *malgré lui* gets a home of his own once more, a glance at his dead baby's picture on the wall will be a powerful stimulus to those sentiments of loyalty to British rule which our modern Straffords hope to inspire by their policy of "Thorough."

Meanwhile the British troops, engaged in the ancient task of making a solitude and calling it peace, are taking plenty of riding and marching exercise, and accumulating merit against the next presentation of war medals. Poor fellows — ragged and half-starved many of them, if not helpless from fever, but giving their lives to make a stockbrokers' holiday! For many of the officers there will be promotions and knighthoods. Why, indeed, should not His Majesty establish a new order? The Order of the Bath is by this time an old-fashioned decoration. Why not recognize the exceptional nature of the present campaign by instituting an Order of the Torch? How proudly would its ribbon be worn, especially if Cabinet Ministers were made eligible! The statesman who boasted that if the origin of the war could justly be attributed to him he would regard it as a feather in his cap would doubtless be even better pleased with a star upon his breast. To him and his associates in the martyrdom of a free and brave nation may appropriately be addressed the exhortation of William Watson:

"Fulfil your mission ; spoil and burn,
Fling forth the helpless — babes as well ;
And let the children's children learn
To hate you with the hate of hell.

So shall the god of war not lack
His tribute, and the long-foiled light
Be for the hundredth time thrust back
Into the night — into the night."

EXUL.

THE METRIC SYSTEM AND INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE.

WHEN but a single man walked the earth his efforts were directed solely toward meeting his own wants. He was not called upon to work to another's orders, but in his own necessities he found all the measures he needed. His axe-handle or walking-stick could have served as his unit of length; and as it would be carried directly from one article to another which was to be measured, it was of no consequence if his crude standard should be lost.

With the advent of the second man there arose, sooner or later, a desire to possess the fruits of each other's labors. But as long as the two parties to the transfer could meet face to face, there was no confusion even when each one used his own measure. It was the exchange of one pile for another pile, of one group of articles for another group. As the circle of exchange grew larger, and money or a token was offered in return for the articles desired, it became necessary for the buyer and seller to have in mind the same sort of money and the identical unit of measure. Thus, out of the complex relations between man and man has arisen the need for weight and measure; and with the forging of closer relations between men and men, or between nations and nations, comes the necessity for the unification of all weights and all measures — the indispensable and universal instruments of commerce.

Although all peoples appreciate the confusion that lurks in a misleading synonomy, we find nations that are willing to continue "the application of the same generic term to different specific things, and the misapplication of one specific term to another specific thing." Or, to become more definite, the English system gives us an avoirdupois pound that is heavier than the troy pound, while the ounce avoirdupois is lighter than the ounce troy. The ounce, the drachm, and the grain are specific names indefinitely applied as indefinite parts of an indefinite whole; a dozen may be 12, 14, or even 16; 28 and 25 are quarters of a hundredweight; and the twentieth of a ton is either 100 or 112 pounds. The quart and the gallon signify in each case three different measures, and in the United States there have been 130 different measures called bushel, none of them conforming to the bushel of England.

In the vocabulary of the metric system there is one specific, definite, appropriate word to denote the linear unit, one for the unit of area, one for solid measure, one for the unit of capacity, and one for the unit of weight. The word is exclusively applied to the thing, and the thing is exclusively denoted by the word. Thus, the metre is a definite measure of length and nothing else; it has only one value at home, and can have none other abroad. This system employs five unit words and seven prefixes, or twelve words in all, while in the English system there are seventy-four units, having fifty-six names, eighteen of which are ambiguous.

In the numerous custom-houses found in small countries it was necessary to keep a force of computers to effect transformations of values upon the invoices of the commodities passing through their hands, because of the diversity of weights and measures and moneys with which they had to deal. The need of a common system was pressing, and the metric system, being available, was taken and legalized without anyone concerning himself with the question whether the metre would have been better if it had been a little longer or a little shorter, or if it had represented something different from what it does represent, or whether, in fact, it really represents anything at all.

So we, who are still outside of the pale of universality, can accept the good features of the metric system and preserve, if we like, our old terms. We can call half a kilogram a pound, the litre a quart, and the metre a yard; thus avoiding the use of terms that seem odd because they are strange. This has been done in Switzerland, and not one person in a hundred knows that a slight change has taken place in the pound to make it equivalent to the half kilogram.

When Prussia adopted the metric system there were a number of units in use, so many that when the Prussian foot, for example, was referred to, it was necessary to specify whether it was the foot of Eastern Prussia or of Western Prussia. So, when the Prussians adopted the metric system, they had not only the confusion of passing from one system to another, but the additional confusion of passing from several systems to a single system.

We have an analogous condition in this country with respect to the bushel. What does it signify? It stands for one thing in one State and for another in another, and even in the same State it means something different for every different product. Wheat, rye, oats, corn, buckwheat, barley, potatoes, and onions are sold by weight, while the prices are invariably quoted at so much per bushel. The number of

bushels is obtained by dividing the number of pounds of an article by the number of pounds of that particular article which make a bushel in that particular State. When oats are quoted at 20 cents per bushel in Ohio, it means to the Dakota farmer that thirty-six pounds of oats are worth 20 cents, and to the Maine farmer that thirty pounds are worth 20 cents, while the Ohio farmer would expect to surrender thirty-two pounds of that product for the sum named. From the reports of our consuls throughout Europe, we see that no cause, since the earliest organization of civilized society, has contributed more largely to embarrass business transactions among the members of the family of nations — especially by placing obstacles in the way of commercial exchanges between different countries, or between different provinces, or even between different cities — than the endless, senseless diversity of instrumentalities employed for the purpose of determining the quantities of commodities awaiting exchange.

One of the strongest objections urged against the adoption of the metric system is the disturbing effect its introduction would have, for a time at least, on the daily vocations of the people. "How would the servant-girl," some ask, "know how many litres of milk to buy if in all her previous purchases she had bought only quarts?" Suppose she knew nothing of the change, and that it began during her sleeping-hours, on a certain date. On the next morning she would hail the milkman and say, "Let me have two quarts of milk." He would answer, "We don't have quarts any longer." "What do you have, then?" "Litres," would be the reply. It is not likely that she would be terrified by the word, but she would ask to be shown a litre measure, and to her eyes it would look so much like a quart that she would at once know how many of these units of milk she would need. The result would be similar if a lady should try to buy a certain number of yards of goods. On finding that she could not have the articles in yards she would ask to see how long the metre was, and she could easily form a fairly accurate opinion as to how many she would require. In the great majority of the petty transactions of our daily lives we are guided in our purchases by the amount we wish to expend, or by the size of the pile the shopkeeper measures out or puts in the balance.

The change in our system of weights and measures would be accompanied by considerable cost, for new scales or weights would be required. As, however, the average life of a counter scale is about two years only, the merchant, knowing in time when the change would be made, would not incur much expense by either hastening or delaying somewhat his

purchase of a scale so as to buy one of the new system. Some new machinery would have to be constructed and new dies cut; but even at present all manufacturers who are seeking foreign markets must have machines which conform to the measures of the country where they are striving to create markets. Many of our shops already keep two sets of machinery on this very account. And it is idle to assume that our customary units would become entirely obsolete on the day of the adoption of the new system. The most radical proposition goes no farther than to say that, after a certain date, contracts, in order to be legal, must be drawn according to the new system. For years to come the use of the familiar units would be permitted, just as at present hundreds of units are in use every day that have no legal recognition whatever — for instance, the bit, the levy, and the hand.

In the Post-Office Department every letter and every piece of mail going out of this country or coming into it has its weight determined in grams. Then why not weigh all mail matter in the same way? The law prescribes in grams the weight of the half-dollar and the dime. Why weigh the dollar in grains? All the operations of the office of the Surgeon-General of the Navy that involve weights and measures are expressed in metric terms; why not equally those of the Army?

If any question should arise as to the accuracy of scales or of any of the instruments used in determining length or capacity, such a question on final appeal must be referred to the Government for decision. But the English standards are not employed in making the comparison. In the case of a question of weight, neither the pound troy nor the pound avoirdupois is called into service, but the kilogram. And although the Government possesses standard bushels and gallons, reference is made to the international litre wherever an authoritative determination is asked for as to the accuracy of a measure of capacity. We therefore see that the adoption of the metric system simply means its introduction into every-day life and nothing more, as our customary units already have their values given in terms of the metric units, and are determined by comparison with them. It is a mistake to suppose that it is the scientists who are clamoring for the introduction of the metric system. They have it and use it whenever they wish to have their writings perfectly understood by the scholars of the world. Apart from this reason they use this system in their studies, because of the ease with which it enables them to ascertain specific gravity and to express measures of capacity in weight.

Just now the nations of the earth are striving to realize the prin-

ple of division of labor, and as contributory to this each is seeking to find where its people's wants can be most economically satisfied, and where their surplus products can obtain the best markets. The one great question now paramount in the minds of the commercial world is how to extend trade — how to remove the barriers that stand in the way of natural tendencies and artificial stimuli. Mr. Furbish, when Director of the Bureau of American Republics, said:

"The failure of the United States Government to adopt the metric system is one of the most inexplicable instances of false conservatism in the history of the country. In face of the fact that almost every civilized Government has seen the necessity of a common system of weights and measures to facilitate the exchange of commodities, the people of the United States have persisted in retaining their old and cumbersome system, which might have served those who believed in non-intercourse with the outside world, but which stands as a barrier to that freedom of exchange to which the whole world is now tending. We send consular representatives to every quarter of our globe for the express purpose of making possible an extension of our foreign commerce, and then busy ourselves in an attempt to make such foreign commerce impossible, and retain a system of weights and measures which adds to our own difficulties and makes us mere barbarians to the more progressive nations."

In the report made by a committee of the British House of Commons upon the advisability of adopting the metric system, extracts are given from letters received from eighteen different and important consulates. Every writer stated that in his opinion the adoption of the metric system by Great Britain would greatly promote her commerce with those countries, and that the fact of her not having that system was exercising a repressing effect on her commercial intercourse with them. There can be no possible doubt of these facts, and the United States, in its commerce, is to-day suffering from the same cause. We are out of touch commercially with all the nations of the world except Russia, with which our commerce is small, and England, with which our trade is not growing. The articles we sell England are mainly grain, sold by the bushel, which differs from the English bushel; petroleum, sold by the gallon, which differs from the English gallon; and cotton, sold by the pound, which fortunately corresponds with the English pound.

At the present time we are seeking to enlarge our trade with nations that use the metric system, or in countries where our strongest competitors are nations using that system. The disadvantages in both cases are identical so far as concerns the use of a system of weights and measures differing from that employed by our customers or by our competitors. The American price-lists are unfamiliar, and the amiability of the prospective buyer must be drawn upon before attention can be paid to our

goods. Then, too, there is no easy standard of comparison with the products offered by foreign competitors. The difference of monetary systems alone is a source of sufficient trouble. When it is increased by the unlikeness of the units of weight and measure, the problem of making a double conversion possesses difficulties for the would-be buyer equalled only by our youthful perplexities in dealing with the "double rule of three." Owing to the likelihood of making errors as well as the trouble of making such conversions, our price-lists and quotations make but little headway in the introduction of our manufactures into foreign lands.

The adoption of the metric system by this country would undoubtedly aid us in trading with nations that already use it. And if it would aid us in selling, it would also help us to buy, by placing larger means at our disposal. Then our increased prosperity would be accompanied by greater prosperity for the other members in the family of nations, and the circle of exchange would be thereby enlarged.

JAMES HOWARD GORE.

IS THE ACTOR ILLITERATE?

In the early days of the drama, notably in the time of Cromwell and Puritanism, the actor was held in the lowest possible esteem. In France persecution followed him beyond the grave. Even the power of Voltaire was unequal to the saving of a beautiful actress of the highest character from a cross-roads burial with a stake in her heart. In England the ashes of the actor were not fit to lie in holy ground. An exception seems to have been made with the body of the player Shakspere; but the opposition to his church burial was so strong that his friends, appealing for protection to the superstition of the time, put over his resting-place the warning beginning: "Good friend, for Jesus' sake forbear."

This treatment of the early actors was largely due to the stage itself. The indecent comedies of Wycherley and Congreve, so long in absolute control of the theatre, degraded the calling of the player, whose rights were denied by custom and law. The actors themselves were ostracized, insulted, and sometimes murdered by the coarse gallants of the period. The following incident may be quoted as an example:

"In 1597 Charles, Lord Mohun, had been tried with the Earl of Warwick for the murder of a young actor named Stokes, who had resented an insult offered to his sister. On being acquitted by the House of Lords Mohun wrote a pamphlet on 'the evils of the stage,' and, to show the consistency of his belief, soon became the hero of another affair of honor, to the great glee of the young gallants of the time. It seems that a Captain Hill, grandson of the Puritan 'Praise-God Hill,' being in love with the beautiful actress, Mrs. Bracegirdle, who despised him, wanted assistance in carrying her off. He found the man and the aid he needed, in Lord Mohun. Learning that Mra. Bracegirdle with her mother and brother was on her way to sup with a friend, the conspirators against her honor hired six dissolute soldiers to aid them. The attempt was made December 9, 1602, but on account of the lady's screams and the resistance of an excited mob, it failed. An odd compromise was made whereby Lord Mohun and Captain Hill were allowed to form part of Mrs. Bracegirdle's escort home. Near by lived Will Mountfort, a rising actor and dramatist. He was the object of the hatred of the lord and captain, who on this occasion made such threats against him that Mrs. Bracegirdle sent a warning word to his house. Will was away from home at a neighbor's, but his wife despatched the message to him. The actor, receiving the news, strolled leisurely to his own home. On his way he met the party with Mrs. Bracegirdle. Captain Hill seized him from behind and pinioned his arms until the bloodthirsty Lord Mohun passed his sword through the body of the poor player. His dying cry brought his loving wife to the spot. Just before he expired

he said, 'Don't weep, Nellie,' and then quoted the well-known lines of Mercutio, a part he had played the evening before — 'tis not so deep as a well, nor so wide as a church door.'

The rascally Mohun was a second time tried for murder by his peers of the House of Lords, who pronounced him guiltless. One of them declared that 'a player had but few rights before the law, and none in the sight of God.' "¹

// What the future of the stage would have been if left under the literary control of such debasing masters as the obscene dramatists of the reign of Charles II it is not difficult to determine. Happily the actor-dramatist soon came to the front; and although his work partook largely of the coarseness and flippancy of the time, it was a distinct advance in the direction of morality, taste, and good manners. Slowly, but surely, the stage has increased in purity and importance, until it has become one of the foremost institutions of modern life, enjoying the respect and admiration of civilized nations.

But what of the actor? Has he progressed with the stage in the estimation of thinking people? How is he regarded?

In England, France, Germany — in every country but ours — grateful tribute is paid to the masters of the stage. England honors her actors with resting-places in Westminster Abbey. This distinction has been paid to several players of revered memory, among them Thomas Betterton, James Quin, Anne Oldfield and David Garrick. The graves of Forrest, Charlotte Cushman, Burton, Booth, and Barrett, in this country, are known only to those who search for them.

Malice and ignorance work together to measure the dramatic artist by the same standard as in the old Puritan days. He is represented as inferior intellectually to men in other callings. His family affairs are at the mercy of the new-school journalist, whose stock in trade is the belittling of the actor's most serious work. Stories affecting his character and reflecting on his honor and his manhood are bandied about as if he had lost every right to fair consideration. Every cheap hanger-on of the theatre who may be engaged in a bar-room brawl is "an actor of prominence," and any poor woman found drunk and disorderly may be spoken of by the news-gatherers as "a one-time beautiful actress."

Abuse and misrepresentation in this form have lately taken a new turn. Several magazines and newspapers have made editorial attacks on the intelligence of actors. By some they are called "mummers." Others follow the line of Doctor Johnson's attack on David Garrick and his calling. "Why do you speak to Mr. Garrick in that way, Doctor?" asked Boswell. "You hurt his feelings." "Punch has no feelings,"

¹ Marchand in "Curiosities of Crime."

said Johnson. This plan of action on the part of the actor's detractors leads up to the interrogatory heading of this article: Is the Actor Illiterate? A most convincing answer to this question lies in the fact that William Shakspere himself was a member of this belittled calling.

The writings of the Immortal Bard might have been lost for all time but for the thoughtful care of two actors, who, in "loving kindness for their dear master and friend," collected and arranged his manuscripts in proper form, their labors resulting in the first folio edition of 1623. The names of the self-appointed executors of Shakspere's great literary estate were John Heminge and Henrie Condell. On assuming their sacred charge they wrote as follows:

"It had bene a thing, we confesse, worthie to have bene wished that the Authore himselfe had lived to have set forth, and overseene his owne writings. But since it hath bene ordain'd otherwise and he by death departed from that right, we pray you do not envie his Friends the office of their care and paine, to have collected and published them, and so to have published them, as where (before) you were abused with diverse stolne and surreptitious copies, maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of injurious impostors, that expos'd them: even those are now offered to your view, cured, and perfect in their limbs, and all the rest absolute in their numbers, as he conceiv'd them. . . . We have but collected them, and done an office to the dead to procure his orphans, guardians; without ambition either of self-profit or fame: onely to keepe the memory of so worthy a Friend and Fellow alive as was our Shakespear."

Though Shakspere is a shining proof that the actor is not illiterate, the proposition can be demonstrated without him. The history of the English-speaking stage shows that actors have been noted for literary attainments. I will cite a few illustrations only from the various periods:

BEN JONSON, contemporaneous with Shakspere, and considered his equal by many in his time.

THOMAS BETTERTON, born 1635, author of eight plays.

COLLEY CIBBER, 1671-1757, poet laureate of England, who revised several of Shakspere's works and originated eighteen successful dramatic productions, including the famous "She Would and She Would Not."

CHARLES MACKLIN, 1697-1797, author of "Suspicious Husband," "Love à la Mode," "The Man of the World," etc.

JAMES QUIN and BARTON BOOTH, fellow-actors with Macklin, while having no plays to their credit, were men of recognized literary worth.

SHERIDAN KNOWLES, 1784-1862. His best known plays are "The Hunchback," "The Love Chase," and "Virginius."

T. W. ROBERTSON, 1829-1871, author of "Caste," "School," etc.

WILLIAM E. BURTON, 1804-1860. The greatest comedian of his time.¹

DION BOUCICAULT, "The Irish Shakspere," 1822-1890.

¹William E. Burton's published correspondence with Edgar A. Poe resulted in the complete defeat of the poet, who brought the contention to an abrupt close with: "It serves me right. I should have known better than to have bandied words with a profane stage player." As Poe's parents were both actors this slur was disrespectful, to say the least. William Cullen Bryant, the one-time friend of Poe, took such an

Coming to our own time, we find a gratifyingly large contingent of author-actors, such as Lawrence Barrett, Henry Irving, James A. Herne, Wilson Barrett, A. W. Pinero, Augustus Thomas, H. V. Esmond, Brandon Thomas, David Belasco, and William Gillette. James A. Herne, whose lamented death occurred so recently, had some points in his career similar to Charles Macklin, whose epitaph was

"This is the Jew
That Shakspere drew."

Macklin wrote the best comedy of his time, "The Man of the World," in which he was unequalled as Sir Pertinax MacSycophant. Herne wrote the best comedy-drama of our time, "Shore Acres," in which he was unequalled as Nathaniel Berry.

It may be here noticed that actors who have "created" parts — that is, who have played leading rôles in their own plays — have generally been acknowledged as the best interpreters of those characters. For instance, Sheridan Knowles in "The Hunchback"; Dion Boucicault in "The Shaughraun"; Charles Mathews in "Used Up"; Wilson Barrett in "The Sign of the Cross," "Claudian," and "The Silver King"; Molière as Tartuffe; and many other stage people whose work cannot be said to have raised the question "Is the Actor Illiterate?"

Sir Walter Scott placed the art of the actor above all others. He wrote:

"I know of no calling that so purifies one's character. Thomas Betterton must have been one of the noblest men that ever lived, and if anything could reconcile me to old age it is the reflection that I have seen the rising as well as the setting of the sun of Mrs. Siddons. God bless the stage and its people."

Impartial observers of present-day players will admit that they are men of intellect and refinement, and students on whom the badge of illiteracy cannot be consistently placed. The very nature of their profession precludes the possibility of ignorant actors winning the laurel. Intellectual discernment, if not education, is essential for the proper interpretation of the author's thoughts. The parrot actor is generally relegated to the rear rank. A man of limited brain capacity may become a successful stage critic, in the popular acceptance of the term, but not a successful stage exponent. It is easy for the facetious critic to tear down in a single sitting the structure which the actor has spent weeks of studious preparation to erect. The pen is mightier than the buskin.

interest in the trouble that he lost his temper over it. He praised Burton for his forbearance and denounced Poe as a "cad and a bully."

Burton started "The Gentleman's Magazine" in 1837. In 1839 he associated Edgar A. Poe with him in control. In 1845 he consolidated with Graham in a publication that became "Graham's Magazine."

If actors were the untutored barbarians described by certain writers, public patronage would be withdrawn from the theatre; every drama would become a farce; and Shakspere an abomination. Imagine a company of stupid, uneducated Thespians trying to produce one of the plays of the immortal bard! Charles Dickens said that "some writers labor under the impression that their mission is to amuse the reading public at the expense of the player. Their pens are steeped in ridicule, though their wit seldom entertains anybody but themselves."

The scurrilous style of some alleged critics causes a suspicion that if they should depart from their accustomed methods and treat the actor seriously, the managing editor would quickly call for their resignations. Fortunately, such men do not represent the many fair-minded newspaper writers of which this country is justly proud. The standard of the theatrical profession cannot be measured by those alleged actors the height of whose ambition is to pose on public thoroughfares. Real actors have neither the time nor the inclination for such statuesque displays. They confine their acting to the stage.

For more than three centuries the dramatic literature of the world has been largely furnished by actors. The greatest play of any time, with the single exception of the Sheridan era — from Ben Jonson, Shakspere, Molière, down to T. W. Robertson, Dion Boucicault, and Augustus Thomas — has been written by an actor. The actor Shakspere invented so many new words, that since the time when "learning triumphed o'er her barbarous foes" no clerical denunciator of the stage and its people has been able to denounce them without using the very words coined by the illiterate stage player.

Doran says: "The actors of Shakspere's time were of grave and sober behavior and men of high character." The modern actor may be a man of the world, but he is none the less devoted to the calling of which the immortal master wrote:

"These, our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits, and
Are melted into air — into thin air.
And like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Yea, all which it inherit, shall dissolve,
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made of, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep."

STUART ROBSON.

MOSES COIT TYLER.

EVER since his death at the very close of the century which ironically and pathetically enough he was not permitted to reach, much less to cover, in his great "History of American Literature," I have been hoping that some qualified person would see fit to pay the ungrudging tribute which the life and labors of Prof. Moses Coit Tyler so well deserve. But the months have gone by, and little has been added to the naturally hasty notices of the man and his books furnished, with their usual celerity, by the newspapers and the literary journals. It is to be presumed that an elaborate memorial by some relative or friend is contemplated, and I am far from supposing that there is any special call for me to attempt the intermediate rôle of providing an appreciative essay of the kind just indicated; but my gratitude to Prof. Tyler and my admiration of his services to American literature and scholarship are so hearty that I trust they will be accepted as a sufficient excuse for pages which I am, in all literalness, impelled to write.

Of the personality of the man himself I shall say little, because, unfortunately, I know little of it. Most of us, at one time or another, have experienced the irony and untowardness of fate in being kept, by narrow intervals of time and space, from ever standing in the presence of people we had long desired to meet, and who, we had reason to know, would not be displeased to meet us. Such was my fate with regard to Prof. Tyler. We were once near enough meeting to have adjoining seats assigned us at a lunch table, but my seat was by accident left empty. Nor could I imagine that the pathetic wish he once expressed in a letter, that I should find it possible to seek him out at his home before his days for welcoming friends should be over forever, was based upon as deep a sense of the frailty and uncertainty of life as he must have had when he wrote. Thus it is that I know of Prof. Tyler's noble and genial personality only through the reports of his friends and through a few letters, although I am in one particular at least a literary heir or legatee of his, since, when his health began finally to fail, the volume on American literature which he had engaged to write for Mr.

Gosse's series, "Literatures of the World," was turned over to my less skilful hands.

But although this paper must perforce deal with Prof. Tyler as scholar and writer rather than as teacher and man, it will not be amiss to give readers who do not care to consult their encyclopædias an outline of his uneventful, but not uninteresting or undiversified, life.¹ Moses Coit Tyler was born of good New England stock, as the far from meaningless phrase runs, at Griswold, Connecticut, August 2, 1835. If his fame ever increases sufficiently to make it requisite that pupils should memorize his place of birth, they will perhaps use as a mnemonic the fact that Griswold is also the name of the man whose pioneer work for American literature Prof. Tyler was destined to continue and far surpass — a man who has deservedly received much harsh criticism, but whose unflagging zeal for American culture in the day of small things merits generous recognition in our own more mature epoch. But it is with the son of Capt. Elisha Tyler and Mary Greene, his wife, that we have to deal, and not with the Rev. Rufus W. Griswold, the much-anathematized biographer of Edgar Allan Poe.

While he was still very young Prof. Tyler's parents settled in Michigan, where he received the training that enabled him to enter the University of that State in 1853. His Eastern connections, however, were still strong enough to draw him back to Yale, where he graduated in 1857. In view of the services of Yale to early American literature, through the work of Trumbull, Barlow, Dwight, and others, it seems to be a most fitting coincidence that the two men to whose labors students of American literature owe probably their largest debt of gratitude — Prof. Tyler and Mr. Stedman — should both be alumni of that institution. It would have been still more fitting could either of them have accepted the chair said to have been offered by their *alma mater*; as this could not be, we must content ourselves with felicitating Yale, in this her bicentennial year, upon scholarly work in behalf of American literature that has not always received its full reward of praise.

After graduating, young Tyler studied theology at Yale and Andover, and in due time and with entire propriety, in consideration of his Connecticut associations, became a Congregational clergyman, the church at Owego, New York, being his first charge. From 1860 to 1862 he was a pastor at Poughkeepsie; but here his health broke down, mainly from

¹ I have been much assisted in this connection by an article on Prof. Tyler furnished by his colleague, Prof. J. W. Jenks, of Cornell, to "The Michigan Alumnus" for March, 1901.

overwork, and in 1863 he went to England, where he resided three years. He was far from idle, for he lectured, wrote letters to "The Nation" and "The Independent," and, we cannot doubt, continued the studies that were closer to his heart than his parochial work. He also published (1864) a little book entitled "A New System of Musical Gymnastics as an Instrument in Education," which was followed up by "The Brownsville Papers" (1868)—volumes for which I have searched two large libraries in vain, but which I gather to have had reference to the deplorable neglect of physical exercise that characterized Americans, and especially American students, of Prof. Tyler's generation.

Returning to America with restored health in 1867, he became Professor of English in the University of Michigan. At this institution, which was then laying the foundations of its great reputation and influence, he did what must have been, from all accounts, admirable work as a teacher. Here, too, he won distinction as a historian when he published, in 1878, the first two volumes of his "History of American Literature," covering the colonial period. As was at once remarked, he had not only written the best book on his subject, but had practically created that subject; at least he had shown Americans that their literature, even in its formative and most unpromising period, was an integral part of their history and of immense value as an expression of their life and thought as a people. It is no wonder, therefore, that his volumes were heartily praised, and that he was encouraged to pursue what he had already chosen as his life-work. The main materials for that work being more accessible in the East—where he had not long before spent a year (1873–74) as literary editor of "The Christian Union," now "The Outlook"—he was naturally willing, in 1881, to accept the chair of American History in Cornell University, a position which he held until his death on December 26, 1900.

Here he continued to work upon his chosen task, making in its interests frequent visits to the most important libraries; for it was his ambition not to leave unread even a fairly influential pamphlet, much less any book that bore the faintest witness to the efforts of his countrymen to develop a national culture. It is to this scholarly conscientiousness of his that the comparative paucity of his writings is due. During the nineteen years of his service at Cornell he added but two volumes to his history—the volumes known as "The Literary History of the American Revolution," which cover only the twenty years from 1763 to 1783. Other instalments are understood to be almost ready for publication; and the little book, "Three Men of Letters," issued in 1895, in its essays on

Timothy Dwight and Joel Barlow really gives us two of the most important chapters that a fifth volume of the *magnum opus* would presumably have contained. But when all additions are counted, it must be confessed that he made slow progress in comparison with many of his contemporaries and with most of his juniors. People who agree in part with Mr. Churton Collins' strictures on the facile work of many modern historians and critics of literature, although they may regret that Prof. Tyler hardly did more than construct an imposing vestibule to the magnificent edifice he intended to build, will be disposed, nevertheless, to honor his thoroughness, and to wish that it may find imitators.

Little more information of this preliminary and general kind remains to be given. To the list of his works must be added a memorial of Edgar Kelsey Apgar, printed for private distribution in 1886, a biography of Patrick Henry in the well-known "American Statesmen" series (1888), and a reprint of some of his newspaper letters from England, which appeared in 1898 under the title "Glimpses of England." If to the ten volumes already mentioned we add a revision of Henry Morley's "First Sketch of English Literature," we have what is practically Prof. Tyler's whole contribution to the literature of which he is the greatest historian, for his occasional publications in the magazines and elsewhere scarcely demand attention. Of the academic and other honors that came to him and of his domestic life we need say nothing; but it is worth while to mention that in 1881 he was made a deacon, and in 1883 a priest, in the Protestant Episcopal Church. It is hardly fanciful to maintain that this change of ecclesiastical connections had a good effect upon his literary work. His inherited Calvinism made him sympathetic with much that was best and most representative in colonial literature; his acquired Anglicanism helped him to perceive the limitations of early New England culture, and also to sympathize with the scantier culture of the colonies not blessed with a Brahmin caste.

Turning now to his major work, the four volumes of "The History of American Literature," with its little pendant, "Three Men of Letters," it is easy to perceive that its best qualities are its abounding sympathy and its scholarly inclusiveness. It has, of course, other merits. It is written in a style that is always clear and readable, and often attractive, although perhaps marred at times for some of us by a slight over-elaboration and by too frequent lapses into that harmless but somewhat irritating facetiousness that makes its existence known by the employment of needlessly sonorous, elaborate, and incongruous expressions. Another merit is the marked critical acumen shown in the treatment of

certain writers — for example, Jonathan Edwards, whose kinship with the world's greatest spirits was admirably brought out by Prof. Tyler some years before the publication of Prof. Allen's biography. Perhaps just as great a merit is our enthusiastic author's ability to discover in some neglected man, whose writings lie buried in the publications of a learned society, a figure of historic interest, capable of stirring our moral, although perhaps not our æsthetic, emotions. This ability is displayed frequently in each of Prof. Tyler's volumes, particularly, for example, in the pages devoted to that noble historian and defender of the Christian Indians of Massachusetts, Daniel Gookin, a name neither euphonious nor famous, yet borne by a man worthier to be remembered than many a writer who keeps his paragraph in our histories of literature simply because no one is brave enough to turn his name into the limbo to which his works have long since been consigned.

But this last merit really brings us back to the abounding sympathy and the scholarly inclusiveness that were said to give Prof. Tyler's masterpiece its chief value. Many a forgotten worthy who ought to be honored lives in his pages because the historian who was so indefatigable a scholar in his researches never for one instant was tempted to play the part of a pedantic dry-as-dust. Naturally, however, such qualities carried with them their own defects. Prof. Tyler was frequently betrayed into enthusiasm over men and books that scarcely deserved a moiety of his encomiums. Not content with praising Francis Hopkinson's "Battle of the Kegs," which is still readable, he almost discovered enough merits in the clever little Pennsylvanian's imitative songs to rank him as a full-fledged poet. On the other hand, he discovered in Samuel Wigglesworth — what would Sydney Smith have said of this name when that of Timothy Dwight affected him so? — an elegist of no mean powers, and in the anonymous author of the epitaph on Nathaniel Bacon, the Virginian rebel, a real poet. The general public, whether in America or elsewhere, is not likely to profit greatly from these discoveries of Prof. Tyler's, because it rightly eschews the minor literature of the past, whether or not it reads the major; but this is no reason why competent readers and special students should not utilize Prof. Tyler's authentic rehabilitations of books and writers, at least to the point of repressing the supercilious tone generally assumed whenever our colonial literature is mentioned.

In this connection I may be permitted to remark that for some months past I have had Prof. Tyler's volumes constantly in hand, as well as a very considerable portion of the colonial and revolutionary literature with which they deal. I have thus subjected his work to

stricter tests than are usually applied by the critic or reviewer; and I am able to bear testimony not only to his accurate scholarship, both in his special field and in the larger one of American history in general, but also to his wide knowledge of British literature, and to his ability to bring to bear upon the mass of literature he passed in review canons of æsthetic criticism which are in the main sound. It is quite plain that those critics who think Prof. Tyler too consistently eulogistic are frequently right; but it is equally plain that his readers can soon learn to discount the historian's praise in such a way that an approximate estimate of a writer's value can be easily obtained. In other words, Prof. Tyler's instincts and training as a critic were thoroughly good; he was not wont to single out for praise men and books that did not deserve it in fair measure. His tastes were sturdy and healthy, yet by no means lacking in delicacy; and when he did not like a piece of literature he said so frankly. The main defect of his criticism had its origin in a characteristic that did him credit as a man — his generosity. When amid the hundreds of dull and ephemeral books and pamphlets which it was his duty to examine he found something that still seemed vital, he was inclined to rejoice overmuch, and to eulogize the author that had lightened his task.

But who shall blame him? If anyone does, I should like to say in reply that I have more than once found myself, with regard to forgotten writers highly praised by Prof. Tyler, in much the same position as the proverbial persons who went to church to scoff and remained to pray. I remember that such was the case when I had smiled at the enthusiastic pages devoted to the Rev. John Wise of Ipswich. I turned to the two ecclesiastical treatises that had won the historian's admiration — not even their names need be given here — and, while I scarcely found the prose so Miltonic as Prof. Tyler had done, I did find myself in the presence of a noble writer of whose existence probably not one American in a thousand has ever heard. So it was with more than one pamphlet and book elaborately discussed in "The Literary History of the American Revolution" — volumes which in their general scope and their specialistic thoroughness represent Prof. Tyler at his best and fully entitle him to rank with the great scholarly historians of literature who were his predecessors, with Ginguené, for example, and Nisard, and Mure, and Ticknor. I do not know whether many readers of these volumes have been tempted to undertake the thirteen sermons which the Loyalist Jonathan Boucher (Mr. Locker-Lampson's grandfather) gathered into a diatribe against the Revolution that drove him to England as an exile; but I took

Prof. Tyler at his word, read all the sermons, and had no reason to regret my confidence. There are, of course, defects in the work that will be more apparent to the special student than to the general reader. Prof. Tyler frequently failed to trace the influence of British writers, especially of minor poets, upon their American imitators, or perhaps it would be better to say, assimilators. For example, the influence of Gray seems to be noted only in the case of Trumbull, that of Collins appears not to be mentioned, and the obvious imitations of Pomfret's "Choice" are overlooked. Then, again, occasionally he passes lightly over a writer who might have furnished him interesting material for comment. A case in point is that of James Ralph, whose career as a journalist has attracted the attention of Mr. Leslie Stephen, but whose early opposition to Pope and curious anticipation of many of the features of the later romanticism have been almost universally neglected. These, however, are matters of slight consequence, which would naturally escape a writer who was more interested in general culture-history than in the evolution of literature.

Enough, however, of my own experiences in following, afar off, in Prof. Tyler's footsteps. It is more important for us to endeavor to determine the main impression that this "History of American Literature," the unfinished but not fragmentary life-work of a true scholar, ought to leave upon careful readers. It seems to me that the main impression it should leave is precisely what its author desired — to wit, a more profound sense of the part democracy has played in American life and culture. If these volumes teach anything, they teach us that from the beginning Americans have wielded their pens for the greatest good of the greatest number. With rare exceptions our writers have consciously or unconsciously assumed the rôle of teachers; and even the most autocratic teacher fulfills a democratic function. Those to whom literature makes an æsthetic appeal only may be inclined to think that a work which deals chiefly with sermons, orations, political pamphlets, histories, and similarly utilitarian productions has no right to its title; but those who take Prof. Tyler's larger view of literature as the written expression of a people's spirit will perhaps find in the democratic "note" that pervades his volumes not merely a sufficient excuse for their existence, but a warrant for the belief that no adequate history of our country's literature will be written by any man who does not build upon the foundations so broadly and so firmly laid by his wise and patriotic predecessor.

Little space has been left for a discussion of Prof. Tyler's minor writings. This is a matter of no consequence with respect to his biog-

rathy of Patrick Henry, the value of which has long been recognized. It is one of the best volumes of a good series, and it did a useful work in hastening that demolition of the Jefferson-Wirt legend which the late William Wirt Henry's elaborate life of the great orator, his grandfather, has, we trust, completed. Perhaps Prof. Tyler took a little too much delight in girding at the inaccurate Jefferson, and perhaps at times the facetious or unduly heightened style to which attention has already been called is too apparent; but a perusal of the book increases our regret that the "Century of American Statesmen," which, as Prof. Jenks tells us, was to sketch the careers of prominent public men from Jefferson to McKinley, remained, seemingly, only a literary project.

This regret is emphasized for the comparatively few readers of the memorial of E. K. Apgar by the high tone of political thought maintained in that unpretending book. How far the services of Mr. Apgar to the cause of good government in New York are remembered in his native State cannot be determined by a new-comer; yet it would seem that the man who almost deserves to be called the discoverer of Grover Cleveland was fully worthy of the honor of a memoir at the hands of a great historian. Unfortunately, the memoir belongs to that exasperating class of books in which use is made of "glowing newspaper tributes," with the result that the fine zeal for pure politics that characterized both Mr. Apgar and his biographer pales before the zeal of provincial editors for recounting the oratorical triumphs of their "gifted young townsmen."

A more interesting and not less pathetic book is the last of Prof. Tyler's publications, "Glimpses from England." It is rarely safe for a foreign correspondent to collect his letters, especially after the lapse of thirty years, yet a sympathetic reader can scarcely regret the few hours spent in making himself acquainted with a volume in which a cultivated and patriotic young American recounts the impressions made upon him by the leading Englishmen of a generation ago. Gladstone, Bright, Disraeli, Mill, Spurgeon, Lord Brougham, and Mazzini, who almost counts as an Englishman, are among the figures that pass before us; and these would make interesting the letters of a less competent correspondent than Prof. Tyler. It is true that in these early writings there is that smack of the lucubration which is not lost in his later books, and which seems to have characterized most writers of his generation; but there is also in them evidence of a wider and sounder culture than is possessed by many modern authors who would blush to lucubrate, and there is a sturdy American independence much to be preferred to the colonial obsequiousness of contemporary Anglophiles and to the spurious

cosmopolitanism of our idlers and amateurs. It is this wide culture and thorough independence that make Prof. Tyler such an influence for good in American life and thought; and it is interesting to the student of his works to perceive that these fundamental elements are present in his writings from the first.

It is pathetic, however, to note how far our own generation, both in England and in America, has drifted away from the ideals cherished by the great men about whom the young clerical valetudinarian wrote with such sympathy and enthusiasm. Mill is pronounced antiquated by writers who may not survive long enough to incur this charge, and for Gladstone and Bright we have Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour. What we have substituted in America for the ideals of Prof. Tyler and his generation need not be enlarged upon here. It is permissible, however, to hope and believe that the noble spirit of patriotism, of scholarship, of loyalty to what was best in the past, and of trust in the future triumphs of the nation and the race, which always characterized this true man and admirable writer, will never be without their inspiring witnesses in this Republic which he so dearly loved, and especially in its literature, to the elucidation of which he gave his life.

W. P. TRENT.

WRITERS IN THE AUGUST FORUM.

MR. FRANK W. CLARKE was born in Boston in 1847. Graduated at the Lawrence Scientific School, Harvard University, in 1867. In 1869 was instructor in chemistry at Cornell, and from 1874 to 1883 Professor of Chemistry at the University of Cincinnati. Since 1883 has been chief chemist of the United States Geological Survey. In 1901 was elected President of the American Chemical Society. Is author of several scientific books and of many scientific papers. Has been a member of the Board of Management of Government Exhibits at the expositions of Cincinnati, Chicago, Atlanta, Nashville, Omaha, and Buffalo; also of the International Jury of Awards at Paris in 1900, where he received the ribbon of the Legion of Honor.

MR. CHARLES A. CONANT, the Washington correspondent of the New York "Journal of Commerce" and of the Springfield "Republican," was born in Winchester, Massachusetts, in 1861, and has been engaged in active newspaper work and in the study of financial and economic subjects. Is the author of "A History of Modern Banks of Issue, with an Account of the Economic Crisis of the Present Century," and a frequent contributor to the leading magazines. Mr. Conant was a candidate for Congress in 1894, and a delegate to the Gold Democratic National Convention at Indianapolis in 1896.

MR. HENRY GANNETT, born in Maine, in 1846, was educated in civil and mining engineering at the Lawrence Scientific School of Harvard University; graduating in 1870. From 1871 to 1872 was an assistant in the Harvard Observatory, and from 1872 to 1878 a topographer upon the Hayden surveys in the West. Was Geographer of the Tenth and Eleventh Censuses, and since 1882 has been Chief Geographer of the United States Geological Survey. Mr. Gannett has been a prolific contributor to scientific periodicals and reports.

MR. W. J. GHENT was born in 1866 at Frankfort, Indiana. Was apprenticed to the printer's trade at the age of thirteen, and was successively employed as printer, proof-reader, and literary worker. Is at present a regular contributor to the editorial and literary columns of "The Independent," and an occasional contributor to several other publications. Was one of the founders of the New York Social Reform Club in 1894, and editor of "The American Fabian" in 1897-98. In 1899 was literary manager of Mayor Samuel M. Jones's campaign for Governor of Ohio.

PROF. JAMES HOWARD GORE was born near Winchester, Virginia, in 1856. Studied at Richmond College, Columbian University, and in Europe. Was three times Commissioner General from the United States to International Expositions, and was twice sent abroad to make special economic investigations for our Government. Is at present Professor of Mathematics in the Columbian University, Washington.

MR. FRANCIS E. LEUPP, born in New York City in 1849, graduated A.B. and A.M. from Williams College, and LL.B. from the Columbia Law School. After a year or two of literary work was appointed in 1874 to an assistant editorship on the New York "Evening Post," then in charge of William Cullen Bryant. On Mr. Bryant's death, in 1878, Mr. Leupp edited the memorial volume published by the

surviving members of the staff. Then removed to Syracuse, New York, to take editorial charge of the "Herald" of that city, in which he had become a stockholder. In 1885 sold out his interest in this newspaper and took up his residence in Washington. Having retained his connection with the "Evening Post," as correspondent and editorial contributor, throughout his stay in Central New York, he continued in the same relation in Washington; presently taking sole management of the Washington bureau. Was appointed by President Cleveland a member of the United States Board of Indian Commissioners, to succeed the late Gov. William E. Russell, of Massachusetts. This position he resigned in 1897. In addition to his professional and official work, Mr. Leupp has contributed to the encyclopædias and the standard literary periodicals and has written some handbooks of information on Civil Service reform.

MR. STUART ROBSON was born in Annapolis, Maryland, 65 years ago. For over fifty years he has been in active service on the American stage. In his boyhood was a playfellow of Edwin Booth and John Wilkes Booth. The three lads often gave theatrical performances in a barn in Baltimore, to the edification of the children of the neighborhood. His first part in a regular theatrical company was obtained when he was only fifteen years of age, in a play called "Uncle Tom's Cabin as it is." In 1877 formed a partnership with William H. Crane, under the firm name of Robson and Crane. Their union lasted over ten years, during which time they presented many notable successes, the most conspicuous being Bronson Howard's "Henrietta." In this play Mr. Robson appeared in his extremely droll impersonation of Bertie, the Lamb. Since the separation of Robson and Crane has appeared in several successes, including a revival of "The Comedy of Errors," "Mrs. Ponderbury's Past," "The Gadfly," and "She Stoops to Conquer." He is best liked in the "Henrietta," and it is on account of the general desire to see him in this eccentric characterization that he has consented to make an elaborate revival of the play the coming season.

MR. JOSE IGNACIO RODRIGUEZ was born in Havana, Cuba, in 1831, and settled in the United States in 1869. Is a Doctor of Philosophy and of Civil and Canonical Law. Was Spanish Secretary of the International American Conference in 1889-90, and of the International American Monetary Commission of 1891, and was unofficial adviser in Spanish Law to the American Peace Commission in Paris, in 1898.

PROF. WILLIAM PETERFIELD TRENT, born at Richmond, Virginia, in 1862, was graduated from the University of Virginia in 1884. In 1888 was appointed Professor of English and History in the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee. Is now Professor at Columbia University, New York.

MR. ALBERT WATKINS was born in Worcester, England, in 1848, and removed to Wisconsin the following year. Graduated from the University of Wisconsin in both the academic and the law department. Subsequently became interested in, and editor of the "Democrat," of Mineral Point, Wis., the "Tribune," of Sioux City, Ia., and the "Daily State Democrat," of Lincoln, Neb. Was always a strong advocate of "sound money." Was postmaster of Lincoln from 1885 to 1891. Opposed Mr. Bryan on the silver question as early as 1892, and quit the Democratic party in 1896 on that issue. Was a delegate to the Indianapolis Convention of 1896; acting as a member of the sub-committee on platform, and taking an active part in drafting resolutions.

MR. HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST, a native of New York, is one of the best-known and ablest writers on political subjects at the National capital. For a number of years has occupied an editorial position on the Washington "Post," in charge of the Congressional and political work.

INDEX.

Actor illiterate, Is the? 745.
Aguinaldo's capture and the Philippine Commission, 259.
American investments, Bonds of foreign governments as, 275.
American view of the British industrial situation, An, 472.
American workman's golden age, The, 688.
ANDREWS, CHAMPE S., Medical practice and the law, 542.
ANTRIM, ERNEST IRVING, The latest stage of library development, 336.
Architectural studies, A plea for, 626.
Arson, Pacification by, 726.
Art as the handmaid of literature, 370.
Athletics, The negative side of modern, 287.
AUSTIN, O. P., Why not three hundred million people? 165.
BAILEY, JOSIAH WILLIAM, The case for the South, 225.
BATES, PROF. ARLO, The negative side of modern athletics, 287.
BLIND, KARL, The Kaiser's speeches and German history, 432.
Blunders, Statistical, 683.
Boer war, a study in comparative prediction, The, 85.
Bonds of foreign governments as American investments, 275.
BOURINOT, SIR JOHN G., British rule in the Dominion of Canada, 1.
BOUTELL, HENRY SHERMAN, The sale of Texas to Spain: its bearing on our present problems, 530.
BOWEN, PROF. EDWIN W., Poe fifty years after, 501.
British industrial situation, An American view of the, 472.
British rule in the Dominion of Canada, 1.
Bryanism and Jeffersonian democracy, 358.
Buffalo, The government exhibit at, 654.
BURKE, THOMAS, The English poor-law, 147.
BUTTERFIELD, KENYON L., The Grange, 231.
CAHAN, ABRAHAM, Russian Nihilism of to-day, 413.
Canada, British rule in the Dominion of, 1.
Canal Commission, The preliminary report of the Isthmian, 131.
Career of King Edward VII, The, 112.
Cars, The lighting of railway, 282.
Case for the South, The, 225.
Censorship, The Manila, 462.
Certain failures in school hygiene, 619.
China, A plea for the integrity of, 515.
Chinese diplomacy, The Machiavelli of, 105.
Chinese traits, Some, 350.
CLARK, R., Certain failures in school hygiene, 619.
CLARKE, F. W., The government exhibit at Buffalo, 654.
COLAJANNI, NAPOLEONE, Homicide and the Italians, 62.
College course, The shortened, 552.
College student, The religion of, 442.
Commerce, The metric system and international, 739.
Commission, Aguinaldo's capture and the Philippine, 259.
Commission, The preliminary report of the Isthmian canal, 131.
Commission, The Spanish Treaty Claims, 713.
Competition at the close of the century, The nations in, 89.
CONANT, CHARLES A., The uses of speculation, 698.
Conference, The Hague Peace, 197.
Convention, The work of the Cuban, 401.
CORBIN, JOHN, Is the elective system elective? 599.
Corrupting power of public patronage, The, 557.
Cuban Convention, The work of the, 401.
Defects in our pension system, 670.
Democracy, Bryanism and Jeffersonian, 358.
Democracy, The Liberal party a menace to English, 587.
Democratic party, The radical movement in the, 157.
Democratic party, What of the? 15.
DENBY, HON. CHARLES, What of the Democratic party? 15; Some Chinese traits, 350.

Diplomacy, The Machiavelli of Chinese, 105.
 Dramatic season, Events of the, 298.
 Edward VII, The Career of King, 112.
 Elective system elective, Is the? 599.
 ELLIS, LEONORA BECK, A new class of labor in the South, 306.
 English democracy, The Liberal party a menace to, 587.
 English poor-law, The, 147.
 Ethics of loot, The, 581.
 Events of the dramatic season, 298.
 Exhibit at Buffalo, The Government, 654.
 EXUL, Pacification by arson, 726.
 Failure of the two-party system, The, 643.
 FORD, ALEXANDER HUME, Our neglected and prospective water-ways, 181.
 Foreign governments as American investments, Bonds of, 275.
 Forests, Sheep and the, 311.
 GANNETT, HENRY, Statistical blunders, 683.
 German history, The Kaiser's speeches and, 432.
 GHENT, W. J., The American workman's golden age, 688.
 GORE, JAMES HOWARD, The metric system and international commerce, 739.
 Governing the Orient on Western principles, 387.
 Grange, The, 281.
 Growing powers of the President, The, 23.
 Hague Peace Conference, The, 197.
 HALE, REV. EDWARD EVERETT, The Hague Peace Conference, 197.
 HAMLIN, PROF. ALFRED DWIGHT FOSTER, A plea for architectural studies, 626.
 Higher technical training, 561.
 HOBBS, PROF. WILLIAM HERBERT, Art as the handmaid of literature, 370.
 Homicide and the Italians, 62.
 Hopee and fears of Russia, The, 69.
 HOPKINS, JOHN CASTELL, The career of King Edward VII, 112.
 HORWILL, REV. HERBERT WILLIAM, The Boer war, a study in comparative prediction, 85; Religious journalism in England and America, 609.
 Housekeeper's stone, The, 453.
 How London was saved, 318.
 Hygiene, Certain failures in school, 619.
 Illiterate, Is the actor? 746.
 Industrial situation, An American view of the British, 472.
 Inland waterways, Our neglected and prospective, 181.
 Investments, Bonds of foreign governments as American, 275.
 Is the actor illiterate? 745.
 Is the elective system elective? 599.
 Isthmian Canal Commission, The preliminary report of the, 131.
 Italian politics, Notes on, 175.
 Italians, Homicide and the, 62.
 Jeffersonian Democracy, Bryanism and, 358.
 Journalism in England and America, Religious, 609.
 "Journalism, Tabloid," its causes and effects, 56.
 Kaiser's speeches and German history, The, 432.
 Kansas, Prohibition in, 200.
 King Edward VII, The career of, 112.
 KOBBE, GUSTAV, Events of the dramatic season, 298.
 KROPOTKIN, PRINCE PETE ALEXEIVITCH, The Russians in Manchuria, 267.
 Labor conditions in Switzerland, 30.
 Labor in the South, A new class of, 306.
 LARREMORE, WILBUR, The spoiled parent, 328.
 Latest stage of library development, The, 336.
 Law, Medical practice and the, 542.
 LEUFF, FRANCIS E., Defects in our pension system, 670.
 LEWIS, ROBERT E., The Machiavelli of Chinese diplomacy, 105.
 Liberal party a menace to English democracy, The, 587.
 Library development, The latest stage of, 336.
 Lighting of railway cars, The, 282.
 Limitations of monopoly, The, 213.
 Literature, Art as the handmaid of, 370.
 Literature, The search after novelty in, 248.
 London was saved, How, 318.
 Loot, The ethics of, 581.
 Low, A. MAURICE, "Tabloid journalism," its causes and effects, 56.
 MACARTHUR, WALTER, The movement for a shorter working-day, 576.
 Machiavelli of Chinese diplomacy, The, 105.
 MAHOOD, HATTIE E., The Liberal party: a menace to English democracy, 587.
 MAINS, HON. WILLIAM C., The radical movement in the Democratic party, 157.
 Manchuria, The Russians in, 267.
 Manila censorship, The, 462.
 MARTIN, HAROLD, The Manila censorship, 462.
 MARTIN, JOHN, How London was saved, 318.
 MEADE, EDWARD SHERWOOD, The limitations of monopoly, 213.
 Medical practice and the law, 542.
 Metric system and international commerce, The, 739.
 Monopoly, The limitations of, 213.
 Movement for a shorter working-day, The, 576.
 MYERS, GUSTAVUS, The secrets of Tammany's success, 488.

Nations in competition at the close of the century, The, 89.
 Negative side of modern athletics, The, 287.
 Negro and our new possessions, The, 341.
 New class of labor in the South, A., 306.
 Nihilism of to-day, Russian, 413.
 Notes on Italian politics, 175.
 Novelty in literature, The search after, 243.
 Orient on Western principles, Governing the, 387.
 Our neglected and prospective inland waterways, 181.
 Pacification by arson, 726.
 Parent, The spoiled, 328.
 Party, a menace to English democracy, The Liberal, 587.
 Party system, The failure of the two-, 643.
 Party, What of the Democratic? 15.
 Patronage, The corrupting power of public, 557.
 PEABODY, PROF. FRANCIS G., The religion of a college student, 442.
 Peace Conference, The Hague, 197.
 PEPPER, EX-SENATOR W. A., Prohibition in Kansas, 209.
 Pension system, Defects in our, 670.
 People, Why not three hundred million? 165.
 Philippine Commission, Aguinaldo's capture and the, 259.
 Place of the Senate in our government, The, 423.
 Plea for architectural studies, A, 626.
 Plea for the integrity of China, A, 515.
 Poe fifty years after, 501.
 Politics, Notes on Italian, 175.
 Poor-law, The English, 147.
 Possessions, The negro and our new, 341.
 Practice and the law, Medical, 542.
 Prediction, The Boer war, a study in comparative, 85.
 President, The growing powers of the, 23.
 President's recent tour, The, 661.
 Prohibition in Kansas, 209.
 QUIMBY, REV. ALDEN WALKER, The housekeeper's stone, 453.
 Radical movement in the Democratic party, The, 157.
 Railway cars, The lighting of, 282.
 REID, REV. GILBERT, The ethics of loot, 581.
 REID, W. C. JAMESON, A plea for the integrity of China, 515.
 REINSCHE, PROF. PAUL S., Governing the Orient on Western principles, 387.
 Religion of a college student, The, 442.
 Religious journalism in England and America, 609.
 Report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, The preliminary, 181.
 ROBINSON, ALBERT GARDNER, The work of the Cuban Convention, 401.
 ROBSON, STUART, Is the actor illiterate? 745.
 RODRIGUEZ, J. I., The Spanish Treaty Claims Commission, 718.
 Russia, The hopes and fears of, 69.
 Russian Nihilism of to-day, 413.
 Russians in Manchuria, The, 267.
 Sale of Texas to Spain, The, 530.
 SCAIFE, WALTER B., Labor conditions in Switzerland, 30.
 SCARBOROUGH, PROF. WILLIAM S., The negro and our new possessions, 341.
 SCHINZ, ALBERT, The search after novelty in literature, 243.
 SCHOENHOF, JACOB, The nations in competition at the close of the century, 89; Higher technical training, 561.
 School hygiene, Certain failures in, 619.
 Search after novelty in literature, The, 243.
 Season, Events of the dramatic, 298.
 Secrets of Tammany's success, The, 488.
 Senate in our government, The place of the, 423.
 Sheep and the forests, 311.
 SHEPARDSON, PROF. GEORGE D., The lighting of railway cars, 282.
 Shortened college course, The, 562.
 Shorter working-day, The movement for a, 576.
 Some Chinese traits, 350.
 South, A new class of labor in the, 306.
 South, The case for the, 225.
 Spain, The sale of Texas to, 530.
 Spanish Treaty Claims Commission, The, 718.
 Speculation, The uses of, 698.
 Spoiled parent, The, 328.
 Statistical blunders, 688.
 Stone, The housekeeper's, 453.
 Student, The religion of a college, 442.
 Studies, A plea for architectural, 626.
 Superintendent from the primary teacher's point of view, The, 47.
 Switzerland, Labor conditions in, 30.
 "Tabloid Journalism," its causes and effects, 56.
 Tammany's success, The secrets of, 488.
 Teacher's point of view, The superintendent from the primary, 47.
 Technical training, Higher, 561.
 Texas to Spain, The sale of, 530.
 THOMPSON, ALICE IRWIN, The superintendent from the primary teacher's point of view, 47.
 THWING, PRESIDENT CHARLES F., The shortened college course: graduate opinion, 562.
 Tour, The President's recent, 661.
 TRENT, W. P., Moses Coit Tyler, 750.
 Two-party system, The failure of the, 643.

Tyler, Moses Coit, 750.
UNDERWOOD, OSCAR W., The corrupting power of public patronage, 557.
Uses of speculation, The, 698.
VOLKHOVSKY, FELIX, The hopes and fears of Russia, 69.
WALKER, ALDACE F., The preliminary report of the Isthmian Canal Commission, 131.
Waterways, Our neglected and prospective inland, 181.
WATKINS, ALBERT, Bryanism and Jeffersonian Democracy, 358; The failure of the two-party system, 643.
WEST, HENRY LITCHFIELD, The growing powers of the President, 23; The place of the Senate in our government, 423; The President's recent tour, 661.
Western principles, Governing the Orient on, 387.
What of the Democratic party? 15.
WHITEHOUSE, HENRY REMSEN, Notes on Italian politics, 175.
Why not three hundred million people? 165.
WILCOX, EARLEY VERNON, Sheep and the forests, 311.
WILCOX, MARRION, Aguinaldo's capture and the Philippine Commission, 259.
WOOLSEY, PROF. THEODORE S., Bonds of foreign governments as American investments, 275.
Work of the Cuban Convention, The, 401.
Working day, The movement for a shorter, 576.
Workman's golden age, The American, 688.
YOUNG, JOHN P., An American view of the British industrial situation, 472.